	-Case 1:20-cv-01226-R	GA Document 179-	1 -	ile	<del>d 06/15/23 Page 1 of 15 PageID #:</del>	
	0400 1110 01 01110 11		78 <sup>.</sup>		3	
			03:03:36	1	Ms. Morrison to sort of tell me where she thought some of	
	1 IN THE UNITED STATES		03:03:43	2	the good information might be, and I would see if it was	
	2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE 3		03:03:46	3	there.	
1	4 REGENXBIO INC. and THE TRUSTEES }		03:03:48	4	So, as I understand it, the notes I made to	
	OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,	; }	03:03:58	5	myself here was that the Plaintiff's theory is that this	
	6 Plaintiffs,	)	03:04:03	6	agreement was relevant to the safe harbor and to damages.	
	7 v.	) C.A. No. 20-1226-RGA	03:04:18	7	And as I sort of understood it, I think the response of the	
	8 SAREPTA THERAPEUTICS, INC. and SAREPTA THERAPEUTICS THREE,	)	03:04:24	8	Defendant here was, We provided you with all the information	
1	9 LLC,	)	03:04:30	9	about all of the SRP-9001 that we made.	
1		)	03:04:45	10	Is that right, Ms. Morrison?	
1		J. Caleb Boggs Courthouse 844 North King Street	03:04:47	11	MS. MORRISON: I'm sorry, Your Honor. Is it	
1		Wilmington, Delaware	03:04:50	12	THE COURT: No, that's all right. You can stand	
1	4	Tuesday, May 2, 2023 3:00 p.m.	03:04:52	13	there for a second.	
1		Discovery Dispute Conference	03:04:55	14	Basically, has the Defendant provided you,	
1	6 BEFORE: THE HONORABLE RICHARD G	. ANDREWS, U.S.D.C.J.	03:04:57	15	Here's all the times we made SRP-9001 in the United States	
1			l	16	and presumably what we have done with it?	
1	BY: SUSAN MORRISON,	ESQUIRE	03:05:05	17	MS. MORRISON: So, that is I believe it's not	
1 2	For the Pl	aintiff	03:05:08	18	a hundred percent correct, Your Honor. We still are having	
2		& TUNNELL LLP	03:05:11	19	a discussion about some batch records. I'm not the closest	
2		K, ESQUIRE	03:05:14	20	to that issue on my team, but I believe there's still	
2		DO C CHILITIAN	03:05:17	21	discussion going on about whether there are some missing	
2	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHA 4 BY: ANASTASIA M. FEI		03:05:19	22	batch records and whether we actually have all that	
25 For the Defendant 02:51:58		03:05:24	23	information, but that's so, I think that's still up for		
			03:05:29	24	debate. But I think the parties are working on that piece	
			03:05:31	25	of it in terms of whether we have everything.	
1						
Ι.	Walter BB C CEER THE	2			4	
02:51:58 1	*** PROCEEDING	GS ***	03:05:34	1	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've	
03:01:03 2	DEPUTY CLERK: All r	GS *** rise. Court is now in	03:05:36	2	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a	
03:01:03 <b>2</b> 03:02:31 <b>3</b>	DEPUTY CLERK: All r session. The Honorable Richard	GS *** rise. Court is now in G. Andrews presiding.	03:05:36 03:05:41	2	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced	
03:01:03 <b>2</b> 03:02:31 <b>3</b> 03:02:31 <b>4</b>	DEPUTY CLERK: All r session. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right	GS *** rise. Court is now in	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46	2 3 4	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.	
03:01:03 <b>2</b> 03:02:31 <b>3</b> 03:02:31 <b>4</b> 03:02:33 <b>5</b>	DEPUTY CLERK: All r session. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.	GS *** rise. Court is now in G. Andrews presiding. t. Good afternoon. Please	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50	2 3 4 5	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some	
03:01:03 <b>2</b> 03:02:31 <b>3</b> 03:02:31 <b>4</b> 03:02:33 <b>5</b> 03:02:35 <b>6</b>	DEPUTY CLERK: All right session. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated. We're here in the <i>Tru</i>	GS *** rise. Court is now in G. Andrews presiding. t. Good afternoon. Please	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53	2 3 4 5 6	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all	
03:01:03 2 03:02:31 3 03:02:31 4 03:02:33 5 03:02:35 6 03:02:42 7	DEPUTY CLERK: All right session. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the <i>Tru Pennsylvania</i> , et al. vs. Sarepta.	GS *** rise. Court is now in G. Andrews presiding. t. Good afternoon. Please	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56	2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that	
03:01:03 2 03:02:31 3 03:02:31 4 03:02:33 5 03:02:35 6 03:02:42 7 03:02:45 8	DEPUTY CLERK: All right session. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated. We're here in the <i>Tru</i> Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta. Ms. Morrison, your cli	GS *** rise. Court is now in G. Andrews presiding. t. Good afternoon. Please	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:00	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't	
03:01:03 2 03:02:31 3 03:02:31 4 03:02:33 5 03:02:35 6 03:02:42 7 03:02:45 8 03:02:50 9	DEPUTY CLERK: All right session. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated. We're here in the <i>Tru</i> Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta. Ms. Morrison, your clitheir name?	GS *** rise. Court is now in G. Andrews presiding. t. Good afternoon. Please ristee of the University of ient, how do you pronounce	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:04	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those	
03:01:03 2 03:02:31 3 03:02:31 4 03:02:33 5 03:02:35 6 03:02:45 8 03:02:50 9 03:02:51 10	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated. We're here in the <i>Tru</i> Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta. Ms. Morrison, your clitheir name? MS. MORRISON: It's	GS *** rise. Court is now in G. Andrews presiding. t. Good afternoon. Please ristee of the University of ient, how do you pronounce Regenxbio.	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:00 03:06:04	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the	
03:01:03	DEPUTY CLERK: All right session. The Honorable Richard	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  t. Good afternoon. Please  estee of the University of  ient, how do you pronounce  Regenxbio.	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:04 03:06:04 03:06:10	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the	
03:01:03	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated. We're here in the Tru Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta. Ms. Morrison, your cli their name? MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  t. Good afternoon. Please  ristee of the University of  ient, how do you pronounce  Regenxbio.	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:55 03:06:56 03:06:04 03:06:08 03:06:10 03:06:12	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.	
03:01:03 2 03:02:31 3 03:02:31 4 03:02:33 5 03:02:35 6 03:02:42 7 03:02:45 8 03:02:50 9 03:02:51 10 03:02:53 11 03:02:54 12 03:02:55 13	DEPUTY CLERK: All right session. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated. We're here in the <i>Tru</i> Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta. Ms. Morrison, your cli their name? MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  t. Good afternoon. Please  ristee of the University of  ient, how do you pronounce  Regenxbio.	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:06:56 03:06:04 03:06:04 03:06:10 03:06:12	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as	
03:01:03 2 03:02:31 3 03:02:31 4 03:02:33 5 03:02:35 6 03:02:42 7 03:02:45 8 03:02:50 9 03:02:51 10 03:02:53 11 03:02:54 12 03:02:54 13 03:02:56 14	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated. We're here in the Tru Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta. Ms. Morrison, your cli their name? MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg THE COURT: Oh, oka All right. All right.	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  t. Good afternoon. Please  estee of the University of  ient, how do you pronounce  Regenxbio.  cbio?  genxbio.	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:04 03:06:08 03:06:12 03:06:14 03:06:16	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened	
03:01:03	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated. We're here in the Tru Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta. Ms. Morrison, your cli their name? MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg THE COURT: Oh, oka All right. All right. So, and I see Ms. More	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  t. Good afternoon. Please  stee of the University of  ient, how do you pronounce  Regenxbio.  tbio?  genxbio.  ay.	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:56 03:06:56 03:06:04 03:06:10 03:06:12 03:06:14 03:06:16 03:06:16	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened to that stuff?	
03:01:03 2 03:02:31 3 03:02:31 4 03:02:33 5 03:02:35 6 03:02:42 7 03:02:45 8 03:02:50 9 03:02:51 10 03:02:53 11 03:02:54 12 03:02:55 13 03:02:56 14 03:02:59 15 03:03:01 16	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated. We're here in the Tru Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta. Ms. Morrison, your cli their name? MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg THE COURT: Oh, oka All right. All right. So, and I see Ms. Mo And Mr. Fahnestock;	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  t. Good afternoon. Please  stee of the University of  ient, how do you pronounce  Regenxbio.  dbio?  genxbio.  ay.  rrison there.  right?	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:00 03:06:04 03:06:10 03:06:12 03:06:14 03:06:16 03:06:27	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened	
03:01:03	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated. We're here in the Tru Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta. Ms. Morrison, your cli their name? MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg THE COURT: Oh, oka All right. All right. So, and I see Ms. Mol And Mr. Fahnestock; And presumably, you	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  t. Good afternoon. Please  stee of the University of  ient, how do you pronounce  Regenxbio.  tbio?  genxbio.  ay.	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:00 03:06:04 03:06:10 03:06:12 03:06:14 03:06:16 03:06:27	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened to that stuff?  MS. FERNANDS:	
03:01:03	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated. We're here in the Tru Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta. Ms. Morrison, your cli their name? MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg THE COURT: Oh, oka All right. All right. So, and I see Ms. Mo And Mr. Fahnestock;	rison there. right? are I'm not sure about	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:56 03:06:06 03:06:08 03:06:10 03:06:12 03:06:14 03:06:16 03:06:27 03:06:28	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened to that stuff?	
03:01:03	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the Tru Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta. Ms. Morrison, your cli their name?  MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg THE COURT: Oh, oka All right. All right. So, and I see Ms. Mo And Mr. Fahnestock; And presumably, you his handwriting. You are?	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  t. Good afternoon. Please  stee of the University of  ient, how do you pronounce  Regenxbio.  bio?  genxbio.  ay.  rrison there.  right?  are I'm not sure about  Fernands.	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:06:04 03:06:04 03:06:10 03:06:14 03:06:16 03:06:27 03:06:32 03:06:34	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened to that stuff?  MS. FERNANDS:  there has been no approval yet. The BLA has been submitted and not approved. There's no commercial	
03:01:03 2 03:02:31 3 03:02:31 4 03:02:33 5 03:02:35 6 03:02:42 7 03:02:45 8 03:02:50 9 03:02:51 10 03:02:53 11 03:02:54 12 03:02:54 12 03:02:55 13 03:02:56 14 03:02:59 15 03:03:01 16 03:03:03:01 17 03:03:09 18 03:03:12 19	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the Tru Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta. Ms. Morrison, your cli their name?  MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg THE COURT: Oh, oka All right. All right. So, and I see Ms. Mor And Mr. Fahnestock; And presumably, you his handwriting. You are? MS. FERNANDS: Ms.	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  t. Good afternoon. Please  stee of the University of  ient, how do you pronounce  Regenxbio.  bio?  genxbio.  rrison there.  right?  are I'm not sure about  Fernands.	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:00 03:06:04 03:06:12 03:06:14 03:06:14 03:06:16 03:06:27 03:06:32 03:06:34 03:06:37	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened to that stuff?  MS. FERNANDS:	
03:01:03 2 03:02:31 3 03:02:31 4 03:02:33 5 03:02:35 6 03:02:42 7 03:02:45 8 03:02:50 9 03:02:51 10 03:02:54 12 03:02:54 12 03:02:55 13 03:02:56 14 03:02:59 15 03:03:01 16 03:03:06 17 03:03:03:12 19 03:03:15 20	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the Tru Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta. Ms. Morrison, your cli their name?  MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg THE COURT: Oh, oka All right. All right. So, and I see Ms. Mon And Mr. Fahnestock; And presumably, you his handwriting. You are? MS. FERNANDS: Ms. THE COURT: Ms. Fer MS. FERNANDS: Yes	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  t. Good afternoon. Please  stee of the University of  ient, how do you pronounce  Regenxbio.  bio?  genxbio.  rrison there.  right?  are I'm not sure about  Fernands.	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:56 03:06:04 03:06:04 03:06:12 03:06:14 03:06:16 03:06:27 03:06:32 03:06:32 03:06:34 03:06:37	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened to that stuff?  MS. FERNANDS:  there has been no approval yet. The BLA has been submitted and not approved. There's no commercial	
03:01:03	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the Tru Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta. Ms. Morrison, your cli their name?  MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg THE COURT: Oh, oka All right. All right. So, and I see Ms. Mod And Mr. Fahnestock; And presumably, you his handwriting. You are? MS. FERNANDS: Ms. THE COURT: Ms. Fer MS. FERNANDS: Yes THE COURT: So, oka	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  t. Good afternoon. Please  stee of the University of  ient, how do you pronounce  Regenxbio.  bio?  genxbio.  ay.  rrison there.  right?  are I'm not sure about  Fernands.  rands?  i.  y. So, I read your letters,	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:56 03:05:56 03:06:04 03:06:10 03:06:12 03:06:14 03:06:14 03:06:27 03:06:28 03:06:32 03:06:32 03:06:34 03:06:47	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened to that stuff?  MS. FERNANDS:  there has been no approval yet. The BLA has been submitted and not approved. There's no commercial approval. And so, there are ongoing clinical trials, but,	
03:01:03 2 03:02:31 3 03:02:31 4 03:02:33 5 03:02:35 6 03:02:42 7 03:02:45 8 03:02:50 9 03:02:51 10 03:02:54 12 03:02:54 12 03:02:56 14 03:02:59 15 03:03:01 16 03:03:01 16 03:03:02 19 03:03:17 21 03:03:17 21	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the Tru Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta. Ms. Morrison, your cli their name?  MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg THE COURT: Oh, oka All right. All right. So, and I see Ms. Mon And Mr. Fahnestock; And presumably, you his handwriting. You are? MS. FERNANDS: Ms. THE COURT: Ms. Fer MS. FERNANDS: Yes	rison there. right? are I'm not sure about  Fernands. roo, I read your letters, ing along two unredacted	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:56 03:06:06 03:06:08 03:06:10 03:06:12 03:06:14 03:06:16 03:06:27 03:06:32 03:06:32 03:06:34 03:06:47 03:06:47	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened to that stuff?  MS. FERNANDS:  there has been no approval yet. The BLA has been submitted and not approved. There's no commercial approval. And so, there are ongoing clinical trials, but,  THE COURT: And so, they're sitting there two years, or I forget what the date was that you said that the	
03:01:03 2 03:02:31 3 03:02:31 4 03:02:33 5 03:02:35 6 03:02:42 7 03:02:45 8 03:02:50 9 03:02:51 10 03:02:54 12 03:02:54 12 03:02:55 13 03:02:56 14 03:02:59 15 03:03:01 16 03:03:06 17 03:03:08 17 03:03:09 18 03:03:17 21 03:03:17 21 03:03:17 22 03:03:17 22	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the Tru Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta. Ms. Morrison, your cli their name?  MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg THE COURT: Oh, oka All right. All right. So, and I see Ms. Mon And Mr. Fahnestock; And presumably, you his handwriting. You are?  MS. FERNANDS: Ms. THE COURT: Ms. Fer MS. FERNANDS: Yes THE COURT: So, oka and I asked the Defendant to bri versions and two redacted versions	rison there. right? are I'm not sure about  Fernands. roo, I read your letters, ing along two unredacted	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:50 03:05:56 03:06:04 03:06:04 03:06:12 03:06:14 03:06:16 03:06:27 03:06:32 03:06:32 03:06:34 03:06:47 03:06:48 03:06:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened to that stuff?  MS. FERNANDS:  there has been no approval yet. The BLA has been submitted and not approved. There's no commercial approval. And so, there are ongoing clinical trials, but,	

	Case 1:20-cv-01226-RGA Document 179-	1 File	d <del>06/15/23 Page 2 of 15 PageID #:</del>
		79	7
03:07:06 1	None of it has ever been sent to Europe, or Japan or some	03:09:57 1	question that asks for your work product, so if you can't
03:07:10 2	other place outside the United States?	03:10:03 2	answer the question without disclosing things you don't want
03:07:12 3	MS. FERNANDS: I don't believe that there have	03:10:05 3	to disclose, just tell me.
03:07:16 4	been , and I believe there's	03:10:08 4	But essentially can you account for all the
03:07:20 5	been some limited discovery, you know, emails as to that.	03:10:10 5	product that they've made?
03:07:24 6	But as far as the clinical trials, those were all run by	03:10:11 6	MS. MORRISON: So, I'm not sure I can answer
03:07:27 7	Sarepta, and that information would be with Sarepta, to the	03:10:15 7	that, Your Honor, but I can answer a slightly different
03:07:32	extent it's being used for clinicals.	03:10:18 8	question which relates to the relevance of the agreement, if
03:07:37 9		03:10:23 9	that's helpful.
03:07:42 10		03:10:24 10	THE COURT: You guys both want to get me back to
03:07:47 11		03:10:26 11	the agreement. Okay. Well, go ahead. Maybe that's a good
03:07:52 12		03:10:29 12	segue.
03:07:53 13	And so, I don't want to misrepresent that	03:10:29 13	MS. MORRISON: And I want to see if I can
03:07:56 14	nothing's been sent, but there's a trial called the 301	03:10:31 14	would it be helpful if I came to the podium?
03:07:59 15	trial that Sarepta is running that I believe is a global	03:10:33 15	THE COURT: I don't know. I can hear you fine
03:08:02 16	trial, but it's a Sarepta trial for FDA submission.	03:10:35 16	from here.
03:08:06 17	THE COURT: Well, so maybe a slightly different	03:10:35 17	MS. MORRISON: As long as you can hear me and
03:08:09 18	way of asking the same question is essentially: Can you	03:10:37 18	the court reporter can, I'm happy to stay here. The
03:08:12 19	account for all the product that has been made?	03:10:39 19	agreement I think the real sticking point between the
03:08:14 20	MS. FERNANDS: I think I can account for I	03:10:42 20	parties, and I will say that Ms. Fernands and my team did
03:08:23 21	don't	03:10:45 21	try to work this out, and I think the real sticking point,
03:08:23 22	THE COURT: And when I say that, I don't mean	03:10:49 22	and they did offer some unredacted version of the agreement,
03:08:24 23	you personally, of course. I mean	03:10:53 23	but the real sticking point is something called the joint
03:08:26 24	MS. FERNANDS: Right.	03:10:56 24	development excuse me, the global development plan.
03:08:26 <b>25</b>	THE COURT: in terms of the documentation	03:10:59 25	And I think the issue is this, Your Honor: It's
	6		8
03:08:30 1	that your company, your client, keeps. You know, they know	03:11:03 1	not so much about it is, in part, about what actually was
03:08:36 2	how much of it they've made. You've provided a spreadsheet	03:11:07 2	made and what happened to it. That's part of the issue.
03:08:38 3	to that effect.	03:11:11 3	But the other part of the issue, of course, is
03:08:40 4	Do they also know, you know, so much of it is	03:11:13 4	what the parties' expectations were as of the date of the
03:08:44 5	sitting in the warehouse, so much of it was sent off for a	03:11:17 5	hypothetical negotiation for damages purposes.
03:08:47 6	trial, so much of it, you know, went bad after sitting	03:11:20 6	THE COURT: Well, right. And so, that's a
03:08:52 7	around for a couple years and we destroyed it, and the	03:11:22 7	damages question.
03:08:57	amount we made is the same amount that we've now accounted $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$	03:11:23	MS. MORRISON: Yes.
03:09:01 9	for?	03:11:23 9	THE COURT: The questions I was asking really
03:09:01 10	MS. FERNANDS: Yes, I'm certain all of that	03:11:29 10	
			had to do with the safe harbor. And I think the way you
03:09:04 11	information exists, and we have tried to provide that in	03:11:34 11	had to do with the safe harbor. And I think the way you wrote your letter, you started off with the safe harbor.
03:09:06 12	·	l	• •
03:09:06 12	information exists, and we have tried to provide that in	03:11:34 11	wrote your letter, you started off with the safe harbor.
03:09:06 <b>12</b> 03:09:10 <b>13</b> 03:09:13 <b>14</b>	information exists, and we have tried to provide that in discovery, because not only did we provide what batches were made, but we also provided a spreadsheet as to clinical trials. Although that could, I think, be updated, but	03:11:34 11 03:11:38 12 03:11:39 13 03:11:39 14	wrote your letter, you started off with the safe harbor. So, I started where you started.
03:09:06 <b>12</b> 03:09:10 <b>13</b> 03:09:13 <b>14</b> 03:09:17 <b>15</b>	information exists, and we have tried to provide that in discovery, because not only did we provide what batches were made, but we also provided a spreadsheet as to clinical trials. Although that could, I think, be updated, but there's a second large spreadsheet in the production as to	03:11:34 11 03:11:38 12 03:11:39 13 03:11:39 14 03:11:46 15	wrote your letter, you started off with the safe harbor.  So, I started where you started.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.
03:09:06 12 03:09:10 13 03:09:13 14 03:09:17 15 03:09:19 16	information exists, and we have tried to provide that in discovery, because not only did we provide what batches were made, but we also provided a spreadsheet as to clinical trials. Although that could, I think, be updated, but there's a second large spreadsheet in the production as to what was sent off for clinicals.	03:11:34 11 03:11:38 12 03:11:39 13 03:11:39 14 03:11:46 15 03:11:47 16	wrote your letter, you started off with the safe harbor.  So, I started where you started.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: But is the damages the more significant issue?  MS. MORRISON: I think at this point it perhaps
03:09:06 12 03:09:10 13 03:09:13 14 03:09:17 15 03:09:19 16 03:09:21 17	information exists, and we have tried to provide that in discovery, because not only did we provide what batches were made, but we also provided a spreadsheet as to clinical trials. Although that could, I think, be updated, but there's a second large spreadsheet in the production as to what was sent off for clinicals.  So, yes, that information could be put together	03:11:34 11 03:11:38 12 03:11:39 13 03:11:39 14 03:11:46 15 03:11:47 16 03:11:49 17	wrote your letter, you started off with the safe harbor.  So, I started where you started.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: But is the damages the more significant issue?  MS. MORRISON: I think at this point it perhaps is, Your Honor, because the damages issue so, our opening
03:09:06 12 03:09:10 13 03:09:13 14 03:09:17 15 03:09:19 16 03:09:21 17 03:09:24 18	information exists, and we have tried to provide that in discovery, because not only did we provide what batches were made, but we also provided a spreadsheet as to clinical trials. Although that could, I think, be updated, but there's a second large spreadsheet in the production as to what was sent off for clinicals.  So, yes, that information could be put together as to what would happen. I think the relevant question here	03:11:34 11 03:11:38 12 03:11:39 13 03:11:39 14 03:11:46 15 03:11:47 16 03:11:49 17 03:11:54 18	wrote your letter, you started off with the safe harbor.  So, I started where you started.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: But is the damages the more significant issue?  MS. MORRISON: I think at this point it perhaps is, Your Honor, because the damages issue so, our opening expert reports for both parties were due this past Friday.
03:09:06 12 03:09:10 13 03:09:13 14 03:09:17 15 03:09:19 16 03:09:21 17 03:09:24 18 03:09:27 19	information exists, and we have tried to provide that in discovery, because not only did we provide what batches were made, but we also provided a spreadsheet as to clinical trials. Although that could, I think, be updated, but there's a second large spreadsheet in the production as to what was sent off for clinicals.  So, yes, that information could be put together as to what would happen. I think the relevant question here is that this agreement isn't going to speak to what happened	03:11:34 11 03:11:38 12 03:11:39 13 03:11:39 14 03:11:46 15 03:11:47 16 03:11:49 17 03:11:54 18 03:11:57 19	wrote your letter, you started off with the safe harbor.  So, I started where you started.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: But is the damages the more significant issue?  MS. MORRISON: I think at this point it perhaps is, Your Honor, because the damages issue so, our opening expert reports for both parties were due this past Friday.  THE COURT: Okay.
03:09:06 12 03:09:10 13 03:09:13 14 03:09:17 15 03:09:19 16 03:09:21 17 03:09:24 18 03:09:27 19 03:09:29 20	information exists, and we have tried to provide that in discovery, because not only did we provide what batches were made, but we also provided a spreadsheet as to clinical trials. Although that could, I think, be updated, but there's a second large spreadsheet in the production as to what was sent off for clinicals.  So, yes, that information could be put together as to what would happen. I think the relevant question here is that this agreement isn't going to speak to what happened to it.	03:11:34 11 03:11:38 12 03:11:39 13 03:11:39 14 03:11:46 15 03:11:47 16 03:11:49 17 03:11:54 18 03:11:57 19 03:11:58 20	wrote your letter, you started off with the safe harbor.  So, I started where you started.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: But is the damages the more significant issue?  MS. MORRISON: I think at this point it perhaps is, Your Honor, because the damages issue so, our opening expert reports for both parties were due this past Friday.  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: And so, our damages expert has
03:09:06 12 03:09:10 13 03:09:13 14 03:09:17 15 03:09:19 16 03:09:21 17 03:09:24 18 03:09:27 19 03:09:29 20 03:09:30 21	information exists, and we have tried to provide that in discovery, because not only did we provide what batches were made, but we also provided a spreadsheet as to clinical trials. Although that could, I think, be updated, but there's a second large spreadsheet in the production as to what was sent off for clinicals.  So, yes, that information could be put together as to what would happen. I think the relevant question here is that this agreement isn't going to speak to what happened to it.  THE COURT: Yeah. So, I understand the question	03:11:34 11 03:11:38 12 03:11:39 13 03:11:39 14 03:11:46 15 03:11:47 16 03:11:49 17 03:11:54 18 03:11:57 19 03:11:58 20 03:12:00 21	wrote your letter, you started off with the safe harbor.  So, I started where you started.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: But is the damages the more significant issue?  MS. MORRISON: I think at this point it perhaps is, Your Honor, because the damages issue so, our opening expert reports for both parties were due this past Friday.  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: And so, our damages expert has submitted his report or his opening report. He has a reply
03:09:06 12 03:09:10 13 03:09:13 14 03:09:17 15 03:09:19 16 03:09:21 17 03:09:24 18 03:09:27 19 03:09:29 20 03:09:30 21 03:09:34 22	information exists, and we have tried to provide that in discovery, because not only did we provide what batches were made, but we also provided a spreadsheet as to clinical trials. Although that could, I think, be updated, but there's a second large spreadsheet in the production as to what was sent off for clinicals.  So, yes, that information could be put together as to what would happen. I think the relevant question here is that this agreement isn't going to speak to what happened to it.  THE COURT: Yeah. So, I understand the question I'm asking is not perhaps a hundred-percent germane to why	03:11:34 11 03:11:38 12 03:11:39 13 03:11:39 14 03:11:46 15 03:11:47 16 03:11:49 17 03:11:54 18 03:11:57 19 03:11:58 20 03:12:00 21 03:12:05 22	wrote your letter, you started off with the safe harbor.  So, I started where you started.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: But is the damages the more significant issue?  MS. MORRISON: I think at this point it perhaps is, Your Honor, because the damages issue so, our opening expert reports for both parties were due this past Friday.  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: And so, our damages expert has submitted his report or his opening report. He has a reply as well. And he relied, in part, on the redacted version of
03:09:06 12 03:09:10 13 03:09:13 14 03:09:17 15 03:09:19 16 03:09:21 17 03:09:24 18 03:09:27 19 03:09:29 20 03:09:30 21 03:09:34 22 03:09:38 23	information exists, and we have tried to provide that in discovery, because not only did we provide what batches were made, but we also provided a spreadsheet as to clinical trials. Although that could, I think, be updated, but there's a second large spreadsheet in the production as to what was sent off for clinicals.  So, yes, that information could be put together as to what would happen. I think the relevant question here is that this agreement isn't going to speak to what happened to it.  THE COURT: Yeah. So, I understand the question I'm asking is not perhaps a hundred-percent germane to why we're here.	03:11:34 11 03:11:38 12 03:11:39 13 03:11:39 14 03:11:46 15 03:11:47 16 03:11:49 17 03:11:54 18 03:11:57 19 03:11:58 20 03:12:00 21 03:12:05 22 03:12:11 23	wrote your letter, you started off with the safe harbor.  So, I started where you started.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: But is the damages the more significant issue?  MS. MORRISON: I think at this point it perhaps is, Your Honor, because the damages issue so, our opening expert reports for both parties were due this past Friday.  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: And so, our damages expert has submitted his report or his opening report. He has a reply as well. And he relied, in part, on the redacted version of the Roche agreement that was produced that's also publicly
03:09:06 12 03:09:10 13 03:09:13 14 03:09:17 15 03:09:19 16 03:09:21 17 03:09:24 18 03:09:27 19 03:09:29 20 03:09:30 21 03:09:34 22	information exists, and we have tried to provide that in discovery, because not only did we provide what batches were made, but we also provided a spreadsheet as to clinical trials. Although that could, I think, be updated, but there's a second large spreadsheet in the production as to what was sent off for clinicals.  So, yes, that information could be put together as to what would happen. I think the relevant question here is that this agreement isn't going to speak to what happened to it.  THE COURT: Yeah. So, I understand the question I'm asking is not perhaps a hundred-percent germane to why	03:11:34 11 03:11:38 12 03:11:39 13 03:11:39 14 03:11:46 15 03:11:47 16 03:11:49 17 03:11:54 18 03:11:57 19 03:11:58 20 03:12:00 21 03:12:05 22	wrote your letter, you started off with the safe harbor.  So, I started where you started.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: But is the damages the more significant issue?  MS. MORRISON: I think at this point it perhaps is, Your Honor, because the damages issue so, our opening expert reports for both parties were due this past Friday.  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: And so, our damages expert has submitted his report or his opening report. He has a reply as well. And he relied, in part, on the redacted version of

	Case 1:20-cv-01226-RGA Document 179-		d <del>06/15/23 Page 3 of 15 PageID #:</del>
,		80	11
03:12:18 1	10K.	03:15:17 1	THE COURT: Okay.
03:12:18 2	MS. MORRISON: It was attached to a 10K. So, he	03:15:18 2	MS. MORRISON: And so I'm sorry, Your Honor.
03:12:20 3	had it, and they also produced that version. And so, he was	03:15:19 3	THE COURT: No, no, no. I thought you were
03:12:23 4	able to rely upon it.	03:15:23 4	pausing there.
03:12:25 5	And in that, he relied upon it because that	03:15:26 5	So, why don't we do this. Why don't I get
03:12:28 6	Roche agreement was signed just about, I believe	03:15:30 6	because you could probably point me to in the agreement
03:12:31 7	THE COURT: Right, right. I gather it was	03:15:33 7	where you think this stuff is that you'd like to have;
03:12:32 8	within a month or something.	03:15:37	right?
03:12:34 9	MS. MORRISON: Yes, very close to the time of	03:15:38 9	MS. MORRISON: I certainly can try, Your Honor.
03:12:36 10	the hypothetical negotiation. And so, it's highly relevant	03:15:40 10	THE COURT: All right. Well, before you try,
03:12:39 11	to the Sarepta negotiator's state of mind coming to the	03:15:42 11	can we get two redacted and two unredacted, one for me and
03:12:43 12	hypothetical negotiation about how important having a	03:15:49 12	one for my excellent assistant here?
03:12:45 13	license would be to Sarepta.	03:15:53 13	MS. FERNANDS: Okay. So, when Your Honor asked
03:12:47 14	And so, I can't tell Your Honor what is in the	03:15:54 14	for a highlighted, we actually highlighted the unredacted
03:12:53 15	global development plan because I haven't seen it, but that	03:15:58 15	with everything that is redacted.
03:12:57 16	is one area where Regenxbio's facts, we can do nothing more	03:15:59 16	THE COURT: Okay. So, in other words okay.
03:13:04 17	than suspect based on what's in the agreement. It's an	03:16:02 17	MS. FERNANDS: I think that might be
03:13:06 18	informed suspicion, I would say, that there are items in	03:16:04 18	THE COURT: Yeah, yeah. You know
03:13:09 19	that global development plan that would be relevant to the	03:16:05 19	MS. FERNANDS: I can also bring an unredacted or
03:13:12 20	damages analysis because it would inform Sarepta's position	03:16:08 20	a clean one.
03:13:16 21	coming to the hypothetical negotiation. And our damages	03:16:09 21	THE COURT: No, no. If it's yellow
03:13:20 22	expert did rely pretty extensively on the redacted version	03:16:10 22	MS. FERNANDS: It is I brought three
03:13:25 23	of the Roche agreement in his expert report.	03:16:14 23	different varieties, but I think that might be the most
03:13:29 24	And so, we do think it's I can't tell you	03:16:17 24	efficient way to see what was redacted.
03:13:33 25	what exactly is in these sections that we don't have, of	03:16:19 25	THE COURT: And so, the yellow is the stuff that
	10		12
03:13:36 1	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be	03:16:21 1	was redacted?
03:13:39 2	there.	03:16:23	MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public
03:13:39 3	THE COURT: Well, so one of the things that was	03:16:24 3	version, correct.
03:13:41 4	said in the letter and, of course, Sarepta went second, was	03:16:25 4	THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you
03:13:53 5	there's a lot of other things in the global development or	03:16:27 5	like to direct me to and you better, I guess because the
03:13:55 6	in the agreement, and there were two things in particular.	03:16:32 6	pagination you have is probably different than the
03:14:00 7	One of them was something like exon and the other was	03:16:35 7	pagination of the one I just got.
03:14:04 8	something else.	03:16:36 8	MS. MORRISON: It is. And what I have, Your
03:14:06 9	And that, in so many words, there's just a whole	03:16:37 9	Honor, are section numbers
03:14:13 10	lot of different things going on at once that have nothing	03:16:39 10	THE COURT: Right. So, go ahead.
03:14:24 11	to do with the patent and the cultured cells. What in his	03:16:42 11	MS. MORRISON: which are, in some senses,
02:14:21			
1	report or her report did your expert do about how did	03:16:44 12	partially. So, I'll start with the one there's quite a
03:14:36 13	they address things like that?	03:16:47 13	few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would
03:14:36 13	they address things like that?  MS. MORRISON: So, I think what you're referring	03:16:47 13	few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would like me to
03:14:36 <b>13</b> 03:14:37 <b>14</b> 03:14:40 <b>15</b>	they address things like that?  MS. MORRISON: So, I think what you're referring to is the portions of the agreement that relate to exon	03:16:47 <b>13</b> 03:16:50 <b>14</b> 03:16:51 <b>15</b>	few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would like me to  THE COURT: Well, there's a magic to the number
03:14:36 13 03:14:37 14 03:14:40 15 03:14:44 16	they address things like that?  MS. MORRISON: So, I think what you're referring to is the portions of the agreement that relate to exon skipping and gene editing.	03:16:47 13 03:16:50 14 03:16:51 15 03:16:53 16	few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would like me to  THE COURT: Well, there's a magic to the number three.
03:14:36 13 03:14:37 14 03:14:40 15 03:14:44 16 03:14:46 17	they address things like that?  MS. MORRISON: So, I think what you're referring to is the portions of the agreement that relate to exon skipping and gene editing.  THE COURT: Okay. Yes.	03:16:47 13 03:16:50 14 03:16:51 15 03:16:53 16 03:16:53 17	few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would like me to  THE COURT: Well, there's a magic to the number three.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.
03:14:36 13 03:14:37 14 03:14:40 15 03:14:44 16 03:14:46 17 03:14:48 18	they address things like that?  MS. MORRISON: So, I think what you're referring to is the portions of the agreement that relate to exon skipping and gene editing.  THE COURT: Okay. Yes.  MS. MORRISON: So, frankly, those are and I	03:16:47 13 03:16:50 14 03:16:51 15 03:16:53 16 03:16:53 17 03:16:54 18	few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would like me to  THE COURT: Well, there's a magic to the number three.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: So, why don't you give me your best
03:14:36 13 03:14:37 14 03:14:40 15 03:14:44 16 03:14:46 17 03:14:48 18 03:14:50 19	they address things like that?  MS. MORRISON: So, I think what you're referring to is the portions of the agreement that relate to exon skipping and gene editing.  THE COURT: Okay. Yes.  MS. MORRISON: So, frankly, those are and I think we've already said this to Sarepta, those are parts of	03:16:47 13 03:16:50 14 03:16:51 15 03:16:53 16 03:16:53 17 03:16:54 18 03:16:56 19	few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would like me to  THE COURT: Well, there's a magic to the number three.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: So, why don't you give me your best three.
03:14:36 13 03:14:37 14 03:14:40 15 03:14:44 16 03:14:46 17 03:14:48 18 03:14:50 19 03:14:53 20	they address things like that?  MS. MORRISON: So, I think what you're referring to is the portions of the agreement that relate to exon skipping and gene editing.  THE COURT: Okay. Yes.  MS. MORRISON: So, frankly, those are and I think we've already said this to Sarepta, those are parts of the agreements that we don't we're not interested in,	03:16:47 13 03:16:50 14 03:16:51 15 03:16:53 16 03:16:53 17 03:16:54 18 03:16:56 19 03:16:56 20	few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would like me to  THE COURT: Well, there's a magic to the number three.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: So, why don't you give me your best three.  MS. MORRISON: All right. Let me look at the
03:14:36 13 03:14:37 14 03:14:40 15 03:14:44 16 03:14:46 17 03:14:48 18 03:14:50 19 03:14:57 21	they address things like that?  MS. MORRISON: So, I think what you're referring to is the portions of the agreement that relate to exon skipping and gene editing.  THE COURT: Okay. Yes.  MS. MORRISON: So, frankly, those are and I think we've already said this to Sarepta, those are parts of the agreements that we don't we're not interested in, but and we would agree to not have those parts of the	03:16:47 13 03:16:50 14 03:16:51 15 03:16:53 16 03:16:54 18 03:16:56 19 03:16:56 20 03:16:57 21	few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would like me to  THE COURT: Well, there's a magic to the number three.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: So, why don't you give me your best three.  MS. MORRISON: All right. Let me look at the sections that were highlighted for me here.
03:14:36 13 03:14:37 14 03:14:40 15 03:14:44 16 03:14:46 17 03:14:48 18 03:14:50 19 03:14:57 21 03:15:02 22	they address things like that?  MS. MORRISON: So, I think what you're referring to is the portions of the agreement that relate to exon skipping and gene editing.  THE COURT: Okay. Yes.  MS. MORRISON: So, frankly, those are and I think we've already said this to Sarepta, those are parts of the agreements that we don't we're not interested in, but and we would agree to not have those parts of the agreement because they're not particularly relevant. But	03:16:47 13 03:16:50 14 03:16:51 15 03:16:53 16 03:16:53 17 03:16:54 18 03:16:56 19 03:16:56 20 03:16:57 21 03:17:00 22	few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would like me to  THE COURT: Well, there's a magic to the number three.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: So, why don't you give me your best three.  MS. MORRISON: All right. Let me look at the sections that were highlighted for me here.  So, one that's missing we believe is
03:14:36 13 03:14:37 14 03:14:40 15 03:14:44 16 03:14:46 17 03:14:48 18 03:14:50 19 03:14:57 21 03:15:02 22 03:15:04 23	they address things like that?  MS. MORRISON: So, I think what you're referring to is the portions of the agreement that relate to exon skipping and gene editing.  THE COURT: Okay. Yes.  MS. MORRISON: So, frankly, those are and I think we've already said this to Sarepta, those are parts of the agreements that we don't we're not interested in, but and we would agree to not have those parts of the agreement because they're not particularly relevant. But the portions of the agreement our damages expert relied upon	03:16:47 13 03:16:50 14 03:16:51 15 03:16:53 16 03:16:53 17 03:16:54 18 03:16:56 19 03:16:56 20 03:16:57 21 03:17:00 22 03:17:04 23	few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would like me to  THE COURT: Well, there's a magic to the number three.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: So, why don't you give me your best three.  MS. MORRISON: All right. Let me look at the sections that were highlighted for me here.  So, one that's missing we believe is partially redacted that's missing information would be
03:14:36 13 03:14:37 14 03:14:40 15 03:14:44 16 03:14:46 17 03:14:48 18 03:14:50 19 03:14:57 21 03:15:02 22	they address things like that?  MS. MORRISON: So, I think what you're referring to is the portions of the agreement that relate to exon skipping and gene editing.  THE COURT: Okay. Yes.  MS. MORRISON: So, frankly, those are and I think we've already said this to Sarepta, those are parts of the agreements that we don't we're not interested in, but and we would agree to not have those parts of the agreement because they're not particularly relevant. But	03:16:47 13 03:16:50 14 03:16:51 15 03:16:53 16 03:16:53 17 03:16:54 18 03:16:56 19 03:16:56 20 03:16:57 21 03:17:00 22	few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would like me to  THE COURT: Well, there's a magic to the number three.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: So, why don't you give me your best three.  MS. MORRISON: All right. Let me look at the sections that were highlighted for me here.  So, one that's missing we believe is

	- Case 1:20-cv-01226-RGA - Document 179-	<del>1 F</del>	ilec	<del>l 06/15/23 Page 4 of 15 PageID #:</del>
,	13 89	ı		15
03:17:25	MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, if I might.	03:20:11	1	be doing together. But there's no way for us to know. And
03:17:27 2	Ms. Fernands	03:20:15	2	these kinds of issues is why we've been requesting
03:17:27 3	THE COURT: Hold on just one second.	03:20:18	3	production of the full agreement.
03:17:28 4	MS. MORRISON: I was just going to ask	03:20:19	4	THE COURT: Okay. So, let me just check the
03:17:31 5	Ms. Fernands if she has a fully redacted version. I don't	03:20:28	5	definitions here.
03:17:33 6	have a paper copy with me.	03:21:17	6	Now, we had a discovery dispute some time ago,
03:17:34 7	THE COURT: Right. Got it.	03:21:27	7	and we were discussing stuff that occurred after the
03:17:36	MS. MORRISON: If she has one, that would be	03:21:36	8	expiration of the patent. Do you remember what stuff we
03:17:37	very helpful.	03:21:41	9	were discussing?
03:17:39 10	MS. FERNANDS: I have Exhibit H to your	03:21:42	10	MS. MORRISON: I believe, Your Honor, and I'm
03:17:41 11	Complaint.	03:21:44	11	sure Ms. Fernands will correct me if I have it wrong, but I
03:17:41 12	MS. MORRISON: Thank you. Thank you so much.	03:21:48	12	believe that we were discussing whether Sarepta needed to
03:17:43 13	THE COURT: So, I'm just curious, Ms. Fernands.	03:21:53	13	produce its forecasts for sales of the ultimate gene therapy
03:17:55 14	So, I'm looking at the Table of Contents under Article VIII,	03:22:01	14	product for after the expiration of the patent
03:17:58 15	and there's in what I have and what's in the public version	03:22:07	15	THE COURT: Okay.
03:18:03 16	an 8.4, and an 8.86 and an 8.8.	03:22:09	16	MS. MORRISON: as well as some other things.
03:18:08 17	And when I look at the going to where	03:22:10	17	But I think that was the main event.
03:18:12 18	Ms. Morrison's directed, I notice that there's an 8.5 and an	03:22:12	18	MS. FERNANDS: I think the main thrust was
03:18:18 19	8.7. And I'm just wondering why they're not in the Table of	03:22:13	19	Sarepta's projections generally for any of the final
03:18:23 20	Contents.	03:22:15	20	products, the gene therapy products. And we were ordered to
03:18:23 21	MS. FERNANDS: I do not know the answer to that	03:22:18	21	produce the adopted and approved projections from the point
03:18:26 22	question, but I hadn't noticed that. And you are correct.	03:22:21	22	of hypothetical negotiation to the present.
03:18:38 23	THE COURT: Okay. Well, I guess we can hold	03:22:23	23	And Sarepta then did produce a number of
03:18:41 24	that thought.	03:22:25	24	spreadsheets for both the assumptions underlying them and
03:18:42 25	So, Ms. Morrison.	03:22:30	25	the spreadsheets for a period of three years with Sarepta's
1	,			and optional to the point of th
	14			16
03:18:44 1	<u> </u>	03:22:33	1	
03:18:44 <b>1</b> 03:18:46 <b>2</b>	14			16
١ .	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed	03:22:33	1	projections in them.
03:18:46 2	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed version, Your Honor. I don't know why	03:22:33	1 2	projections in them.  THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those
03:18:46 <b>2</b> 03:18:47 <b>3</b>	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed version, Your Honor. I don't know why THE COURT: Probably a lot of last-minute	03:22:33 03:22:35 03:22:37 03:22:41	1 2 3	projections in them.  THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those projections, are those things that your damages expert used?
03:18:46 <b>2</b> 03:18:47 <b>3</b> 03:18:50 <b>4</b>	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed version, Your Honor. I don't know why THE COURT: Probably a lot of last-minute changes.	03:22:33 03:22:35 03:22:37 03:22:41	1 2 3 4	projections in them.  THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those projections, are those things that your damages expert used?  MS. MORRISON: Yes.
03:18:46 <b>2</b> 03:18:47 <b>3</b> 03:18:50 <b>4</b> 03:18:50 <b>5</b>	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed version, Your Honor. I don't know why THE COURT: Probably a lot of last-minute changes. All right. So, you were directing me to 8.4; is	03:22:33 03:22:35 03:22:37 03:22:41 03:22:42	1 2 3 4 5	projections in them.  THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those projections, are those things that your damages expert used?  MS. MORRISON: Yes.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'd have to say,
03:18:46 <b>2</b> 03:18:47 <b>3</b> 03:18:50 <b>4</b> 03:18:50 <b>5</b> 03:18:53 <b>6</b>	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed version, Your Honor. I don't know why THE COURT: Probably a lot of last-minute changes. All right. So, you were directing me to 8.4; is that right, or 8.41?	03:22:33 03:22:35 03:22:37 03:22:41 03:22:42	1 2 3 4 5	projections in them.  THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those projections, are those things that your damages expert used?  MS. MORRISON: Yes.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'd have to say, looking at 8.4.1A and B, I have difficulty thinking that
03:18:46 <b>2</b> 03:18:47 <b>3</b> 03:18:50 <b>4</b> 03:18:50 <b>5</b> 03:18:53 <b>6</b> 03:18:55 <b>7</b>	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed version, Your Honor. I don't know why THE COURT: Probably a lot of last-minute changes. All right. So, you were directing me to 8.4; is that right, or 8.41? MS. MORRISON: Yes, 8.4.1 is the first place I	03:22:33 03:22:35 03:22:37 03:22:41 03:22:42 03:22:46 03:22:57	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	projections in them.  THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those projections, are those things that your damages expert used?  MS. MORRISON: Yes.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'd have to say, looking at 8.4.1A and B, I have difficulty thinking that those help any. They certainly don't have any numbers in
03:18:46 2 03:18:47 3 03:18:50 4 03:18:50 5 03:18:53 6 03:18:55 7 03:18:59 8	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed version, Your Honor. I don't know why THE COURT: Probably a lot of last-minute changes. All right. So, you were directing me to 8.4; is that right, or 8.41? MS. MORRISON: Yes, 8.4.1 is the first place I would direct Your Honor. That Section 8.4 is entitled	03:22:33 03:22:35 03:22:37 03:22:41 03:22:42 03:22:46 03:22:57	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	projections in them.  THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those projections, are those things that your damages expert used?  MS. MORRISON: Yes.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'd have to say, looking at 8.4.1A and B, I have difficulty thinking that those help any. They certainly don't have any numbers in them. So, that's tentatively what I think about that.
03:18:46 2 03:18:47 3 03:18:50 4 03:18:50 5 03:18:53 6 03:18:55 7 03:18:59 8 03:19:06 9	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed version, Your Honor. I don't know why THE COURT: Probably a lot of last-minute changes. All right. So, you were directing me to 8.4; is that right, or 8.41? MS. MORRISON: Yes, 8.4.1 is the first place I would direct Your Honor. That Section 8.4 is entitled "Demand Forecast Plans."	03:22:33 03:22:35 03:22:37 03:22:41 03:22:42 03:22:46 03:22:57 03:23:01	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	projections in them.  THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those projections, are those things that your damages expert used?  MS. MORRISON: Yes.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'd have to say, looking at 8.4.1A and B, I have difficulty thinking that those help any. They certainly don't have any numbers in them. So, that's tentatively what I think about that.  Why don't you try another one.
03:18:46 2 03:18:47 3 03:18:50 4 03:18:50 5 03:18:53 6 03:18:55 7 03:18:59 8 03:19:06 9 03:19:06 10	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed version, Your Honor. I don't know why THE COURT: Probably a lot of last-minute changes. All right. So, you were directing me to 8.4; is that right, or 8.41? MS. MORRISON: Yes, 8.4.1 is the first place I would direct Your Honor. That Section 8.4 is entitled "Demand Forecast Plans." THE COURT: Right. And then, because I'm	03:22:33 03:22:35 03:22:37 03:22:41 03:22:42 03:22:46 03:22:57 03:23:06 03:23:08	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	projections in them.  THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those projections, are those things that your damages expert used?  MS. MORRISON: Yes.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'd have to say, looking at 8.4.1A and B, I have difficulty thinking that those help any. They certainly don't have any numbers in them. So, that's tentatively what I think about that.  Why don't you try another one.  MS. MORRISON: Sure, Your Honor. So, the next
03:18:46 2 03:18:47 3 03:18:50 4 03:18:50 5 03:18:53 6 03:18:55 7 03:18:59 8 03:19:06 9 03:19:06 10 03:19:09 11	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed version, Your Honor. I don't know why THE COURT: Probably a lot of last-minute changes. All right. So, you were directing me to 8.4; is that right, or 8.41? MS. MORRISON: Yes, 8.4.1 is the first place I would direct Your Honor. That Section 8.4 is entitled "Demand Forecast Plans." THE COURT: Right. And then, because I'm working on the assumption that if it's not in yellow, I can	03:22:33 03:22:35 03:22:37 03:22:41 03:22:42 03:22:46 03:22:57 03:23:01 03:23:09	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	projections in them.  THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those projections, are those things that your damages expert used?  MS. MORRISON: Yes.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'd have to say, looking at 8.4.1A and B, I have difficulty thinking that those help any. They certainly don't have any numbers in them. So, that's tentatively what I think about that.  Why don't you try another one.  MS. MORRISON: Sure, Your Honor. So, the next one, and I mentioned this earlier, is the Joint Global
03:18:46 2 03:18:47 3 03:18:50 4 03:18:50 5 03:18:53 6 03:18:55 7 03:18:59 8 03:19:06 9 03:19:06 10 03:19:09 11 03:19:12 12	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed version, Your Honor. I don't know why THE COURT: Probably a lot of last-minute changes. All right. So, you were directing me to 8.4; is that right, or 8.41? MS. MORRISON: Yes, 8.4.1 is the first place I would direct Your Honor. That Section 8.4 is entitled "Demand Forecast Plans." THE COURT: Right. And then, because I'm working on the assumption that if it's not in yellow, I can say it out loud, 8.4.1 is "Details."	03:22:33 03:22:35 03:22:37 03:22:41 03:22:42 03:22:46 03:22:57 03:23:06 03:23:08 03:23:09	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	projections in them.  THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those projections, are those things that your damages expert used?  MS. MORRISON: Yes.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'd have to say, looking at 8.4.1A and B, I have difficulty thinking that those help any. They certainly don't have any numbers in them. So, that's tentatively what I think about that.  Why don't you try another one.  MS. MORRISON: Sure, Your Honor. So, the next one, and I mentioned this earlier, is the Joint Global Development Plan, which is the schedule to the agreement.
03:18:46 2 03:18:47 3 03:18:50 4 03:18:50 5 03:18:53 6 03:18:55 7 03:18:59 8 03:19:06 9 03:19:06 10 03:19:09 11 03:19:15 13	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed version, Your Honor. I don't know why THE COURT: Probably a lot of last-minute changes. All right. So, you were directing me to 8.4; is that right, or 8.41? MS. MORRISON: Yes, 8.4.1 is the first place I would direct Your Honor. That Section 8.4 is entitled "Demand Forecast Plans." THE COURT: Right. And then, because I'm working on the assumption that if it's not in yellow, I can say it out loud, 8.4.1 is "Details." MS. MORRISON: Correct, Your Honor.	03.22:33 03.22:35 03.22:37 03.22:41 03.22:42 03.22:46 03.22:57 03.23:01 03.23:08 03.23:08 03.23:15	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	projections in them.  THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those projections, are those things that your damages expert used?  MS. MORRISON: Yes.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'd have to say, looking at 8.4.1A and B, I have difficulty thinking that those help any. They certainly don't have any numbers in them. So, that's tentatively what I think about that.  Why don't you try another one.  MS. MORRISON: Sure, Your Honor. So, the next one, and I mentioned this earlier, is the Joint Global Development Plan, which is the schedule to the agreement. It's Schedule 4.3.1. So, I expect that will be at the very
03:18:46 2 03:18:47 3 03:18:50 4 03:18:50 5 03:18:53 6 03:18:55 7 03:18:59 8 03:19:06 9 03:19:06 10 03:19:09 11 03:19:15 12 03:19:15 13 03:19:16 14	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed version, Your Honor. I don't know why THE COURT: Probably a lot of last-minute changes. All right. So, you were directing me to 8.4; is that right, or 8.41? MS. MORRISON: Yes, 8.4.1 is the first place I would direct Your Honor. That Section 8.4 is entitled "Demand Forecast Plans." THE COURT: Right. And then, because I'm working on the assumption that if it's not in yellow, I can say it out loud, 8.4.1 is "Details." MS. MORRISON: Correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: And hold on. Let me just read it	03:22:33 03:22:35 03:22:37 03:22:41 03:22:42 03:22:46 03:22:57 03:23:06 03:23:06 03:23:09 03:23:13 03:23:15 03:23:21	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 110 111 112 113 114 115	projections in them.  THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those projections, are those things that your damages expert used?  MS. MORRISON: Yes.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'd have to say, looking at 8.4.1A and B, I have difficulty thinking that those help any. They certainly don't have any numbers in them. So, that's tentatively what I think about that.  Why don't you try another one.  MS. MORRISON: Sure, Your Honor. So, the next one, and I mentioned this earlier, is the Joint Global Development Plan, which is the schedule to the agreement. It's Schedule 4.3.1. So, I expect that will be at the very back, Your Honor, but again, it's not attached to the
03:18:46 2 03:18:47 3 03:18:50 4 03:18:50 5 03:18:53 6 03:18:55 7 03:18:59 8 03:19:06 9 03:19:06 10 03:19:09 11 03:19:15 13 03:19:15 13 03:19:16 14 03:19:20 15	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed version, Your Honor. I don't know why THE COURT: Probably a lot of last-minute changes. All right. So, you were directing me to 8.4; is that right, or 8.41? MS. MORRISON: Yes, 8.4.1 is the first place I would direct Your Honor. That Section 8.4 is entitled "Demand Forecast Plans." THE COURT: Right. And then, because I'm working on the assumption that if it's not in yellow, I can say it out loud, 8.4.1 is "Details." MS. MORRISON: Correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: And hold on. Let me just read it for a minute.	03:22:33 03:22:35 03:22:37 03:22:41 03:22:42 03:22:46 03:22:57 03:23:00 03:23:00 03:23:00 03:23:13 03:23:15 03:23:21	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	projections in them.  THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those projections, are those things that your damages expert used?  MS. MORRISON: Yes.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'd have to say, looking at 8.4.1A and B, I have difficulty thinking that those help any. They certainly don't have any numbers in them. So, that's tentatively what I think about that.  Why don't you try another one.  MS. MORRISON: Sure, Your Honor. So, the next one, and I mentioned this earlier, is the Joint Global Development Plan, which is the schedule to the agreement. It's Schedule 4.3.1. So, I expect that will be at the very back, Your Honor, but again, it's not attached to the version that
03:18:46 2 03:18:47 3 03:18:50 4 03:18:50 5 03:18:53 6 03:18:55 7 03:18:59 8 03:19:06 9 03:19:06 10 03:19:09 11 03:19:15 13 03:19:16 14 03:19:20 15 03:19:46 16	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed version, Your Honor. I don't know why THE COURT: Probably a lot of last-minute changes. All right. So, you were directing me to 8.4; is that right, or 8.41? MS. MORRISON: Yes, 8.4.1 is the first place I would direct Your Honor. That Section 8.4 is entitled "Demand Forecast Plans." THE COURT: Right. And then, because I'm working on the assumption that if it's not in yellow, I can say it out loud, 8.4.1 is "Details." MS. MORRISON: Correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: And hold on. Let me just read it for a minute. So, are you expecting there to be numbers of	03.22:33 03.22:35 03.22:37 03.22:41 03.22:42 03.22:46 03.22:57 03.23:01 03.23:08 03.23:08 03.23:15 03.23:21 03.23:22 03.23:23	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	projections in them.  THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those projections, are those things that your damages expert used?  MS. MORRISON: Yes.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'd have to say, looking at 8.4.1A and B, I have difficulty thinking that those help any. They certainly don't have any numbers in them. So, that's tentatively what I think about that.  Why don't you try another one.  MS. MORRISON: Sure, Your Honor. So, the next one, and I mentioned this earlier, is the Joint Global Development Plan, which is the schedule to the agreement. It's Schedule 4.3.1. So, I expect that will be at the very back, Your Honor, but again, it's not attached to the version that  THE COURT: 4.3.1, "Joint Global Development
03:18:46 2 03:18:47 3 03:18:50 4 03:18:50 5 03:18:53 6 03:18:55 7 03:18:59 8 03:19:06 10 03:19:09 11 03:19:15 13 03:19:16 14 03:19:20 15 03:19:46 16 03:19:49 17	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed version, Your Honor. I don't know why  THE COURT: Probably a lot of last-minute changes.  All right. So, you were directing me to 8.4; is that right, or 8.41?  MS. MORRISON: Yes, 8.4.1 is the first place I would direct Your Honor. That Section 8.4 is entitled "Demand Forecast Plans."  THE COURT: Right. And then, because I'm working on the assumption that if it's not in yellow, I can say it out loud, 8.4.1 is "Details."  MS. MORRISON: Correct, Your Honor.  THE COURT: And hold on. Let me just read it for a minute.  So, are you expecting there to be numbers of some kind in these paragraphs?	03:22:33 03:22:35 03:22:37 03:22:41 03:22:42 03:22:46 03:22:57 03:23:06 03:23:06 03:23:09 03:23:13 03:23:15 03:23:21 03:23:22 03:23:23 03:23:26	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	projections in them.  THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those projections, are those things that your damages expert used?  MS. MORRISON: Yes.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'd have to say, looking at 8.4.1A and B, I have difficulty thinking that those help any. They certainly don't have any numbers in them. So, that's tentatively what I think about that.  Why don't you try another one.  MS. MORRISON: Sure, Your Honor. So, the next one, and I mentioned this earlier, is the Joint Global Development Plan, which is the schedule to the agreement. It's Schedule 4.3.1. So, I expect that will be at the very back, Your Honor, but again, it's not attached to the version that  THE COURT: 4.3.1, "Joint Global Development Plan." I see it.
03:18:46 2 03:18:47 3 03:18:50 4 03:18:50 5 03:18:53 6 03:18:55 7 03:18:59 8 03:19:06 9 03:19:06 10 03:19:06 11 03:19:12 12 03:19:15 13 03:19:16 14 03:19:20 15 03:19:46 16 03:19:49 17 03:19:50 18	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed version, Your Honor. I don't know why THE COURT: Probably a lot of last-minute changes. All right. So, you were directing me to 8.4; is that right, or 8.41? MS. MORRISON: Yes, 8.4.1 is the first place I would direct Your Honor. That Section 8.4 is entitled "Demand Forecast Plans." THE COURT: Right. And then, because I'm working on the assumption that if it's not in yellow, I can say it out loud, 8.4.1 is "Details." MS. MORRISON: Correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: And hold on. Let me just read it for a minute. So, are you expecting there to be numbers of some kind in these paragraphs? MS. MORRISON: Your Honor, it's very difficult	03.22:33 03.22:35 03.22:37 03.22:41 03.22:42 03.22:46 03.22:57 03.23:01 03.23:08 03.23:09 03.23:15 03.23:21 03.23:22 03.23:22 03.23:23 03.23:26 03.23:27	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 110 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119	projections in them.  THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those projections, are those things that your damages expert used?  MS. MORRISON: Yes.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'd have to say, looking at 8.4.1A and B, I have difficulty thinking that those help any. They certainly don't have any numbers in them. So, that's tentatively what I think about that.  Why don't you try another one.  MS. MORRISON: Sure, Your Honor. So, the next one, and I mentioned this earlier, is the Joint Global Development Plan, which is the schedule to the agreement. It's Schedule 4.3.1. So, I expect that will be at the very back, Your Honor, but again, it's not attached to the version that  THE COURT: 4.3.1, "Joint Global Development Plan." I see it.  MS. MORRISON: Yes, Your Honor.
03:18:46 2 03:18:47 3 03:18:50 4 03:18:50 5 03:18:53 6 03:18:55 7 03:18:59 8 03:19:06 10 03:19:09 11 03:19:12 12 03:19:15 13 03:19:16 14 03:19:20 15 03:19:46 16 03:19:49 17 03:19:50 18	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed version, Your Honor. I don't know why THE COURT: Probably a lot of last-minute changes. All right. So, you were directing me to 8.4; is that right, or 8.41? MS. MORRISON: Yes, 8.4.1 is the first place I would direct Your Honor. That Section 8.4 is entitled "Demand Forecast Plans." THE COURT: Right. And then, because I'm working on the assumption that if it's not in yellow, I can say it out loud, 8.4.1 is "Details." MS. MORRISON: Correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: And hold on. Let me just read it for a minute. So, are you expecting there to be numbers of some kind in these paragraphs? MS. MORRISON: Your Honor, it's very difficult for me to tell because in the fully redacted version, it	03.22:33 03.22:35 03.22:37 03.22:41 03.22:42 03.22:46 03.22:46 03.23:01 03.23:01 03.23:09 03.23:09 03.23:15 03.23:21 03.23:22 03.23:23 03.23:23 03.23:23 03.23:28	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	projections in them.  THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those projections, are those things that your damages expert used?  MS. MORRISON: Yes.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'd have to say, looking at 8.4.1A and B, I have difficulty thinking that those help any. They certainly don't have any numbers in them. So, that's tentatively what I think about that.  Why don't you try another one.  MS. MORRISON: Sure, Your Honor. So, the next one, and I mentioned this earlier, is the Joint Global Development Plan, which is the schedule to the agreement. It's Schedule 4.3.1. So, I expect that will be at the very back, Your Honor, but again, it's not attached to the version that  THE COURT: 4.3.1, "Joint Global Development Plan." I see it.  MS. MORRISON: Yes, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Or, I mean, I see the schedule. Ah,
03:18:46 2 03:18:47 3 03:18:50 4 03:18:50 5 03:18:53 6 03:18:55 7 03:18:59 8 03:19:06 10 03:19:06 10 03:19:15 13 03:19:15 13 03:19:16 14 03:19:20 15 03:19:46 16 03:19:49 17 03:19:50 18 03:19:51 19 03:19:51 19	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed version, Your Honor. I don't know why THE COURT: Probably a lot of last-minute changes. All right. So, you were directing me to 8.4; is that right, or 8.41? MS. MORRISON: Yes, 8.4.1 is the first place I would direct Your Honor. That Section 8.4 is entitled "Demand Forecast Plans." THE COURT: Right. And then, because I'm working on the assumption that if it's not in yellow, I can say it out loud, 8.4.1 is "Details." MS. MORRISON: Correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: And hold on. Let me just read it for a minute. So, are you expecting there to be numbers of some kind in these paragraphs? MS. MORRISON: Your Honor, it's very difficult for me to tell because in the fully redacted version, it simply has an asterisk. Your Honor can't see that from	03:22:33 03:22:35 03:22:37 03:22:41 03:22:42 03:22:46 03:22:57 03:23:01 03:23:06 03:23:09 03:23:13 03:23:15 03:23:21 03:23:22 03:23:22 03:23:22 03:23:22 03:23:23	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	projections in them.  THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those projections, are those things that your damages expert used?  MS. MORRISON: Yes.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'd have to say, looking at 8.4.1A and B, I have difficulty thinking that those help any. They certainly don't have any numbers in them. So, that's tentatively what I think about that.  Why don't you try another one.  MS. MORRISON: Sure, Your Honor. So, the next one, and I mentioned this earlier, is the Joint Global Development Plan, which is the schedule to the agreement. It's Schedule 4.3.1. So, I expect that will be at the very back, Your Honor, but again, it's not attached to the version that  THE COURT: 4.3.1, "Joint Global Development Plan." I see it.  MS. MORRISON: Yes, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Or, I mean, I see the schedule. Ah, okay. Development Global Development Plan.
03:18:46 2 03:18:47 3 03:18:50 4 03:18:50 5 03:18:55 7 03:18:59 8 03:19:06 9 03:19:06 10 03:19:09 11 03:19:12 12 03:19:15 13 03:19:16 14 03:19:20 15 03:19:46 16 03:19:49 17 03:19:50 18 03:19:51 19 03:19:51 20	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed version, Your Honor. I don't know why THE COURT: Probably a lot of last-minute changes. All right. So, you were directing me to 8.4; is that right, or 8.41? MS. MORRISON: Yes, 8.4.1 is the first place I would direct Your Honor. That Section 8.4 is entitled "Demand Forecast Plans." THE COURT: Right. And then, because I'm working on the assumption that if it's not in yellow, I can say it out loud, 8.4.1 is "Details." MS. MORRISON: Correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: And hold on. Let me just read it for a minute. So, are you expecting there to be numbers of some kind in these paragraphs? MS. MORRISON: Your Honor, it's very difficult for me to tell because in the fully redacted version, it simply has an asterisk. Your Honor can't see that from here. I apologize. I don't know why I'm holding it up.	03.22:33 03.22:35 03.22:37 03.22:41 03.22:42 03.22:46 03.22:57 03.23:01 03.23:08 03.23:09 03.23:15 03.23:21 03.23:22 03.23:22 03.23:23 03.23:27 03.23:28 03.24:37 03.26:16	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	projections in them.  THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those projections, are those things that your damages expert used?  MS. MORRISON: Yes.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'd have to say, looking at 8.4.1A and B, I have difficulty thinking that those help any. They certainly don't have any numbers in them. So, that's tentatively what I think about that.  Why don't you try another one.  MS. MORRISON: Sure, Your Honor. So, the next one, and I mentioned this earlier, is the Joint Global Development Plan, which is the schedule to the agreement. It's Schedule 4.3.1. So, I expect that will be at the very back, Your Honor, but again, it's not attached to the version that  THE COURT: 4.3.1, "Joint Global Development Plan." I see it.  MS. MORRISON: Yes, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Or, I mean, I see the schedule. Ah, okay. Development Global Development Plan.  Ms. Fernands, I'm looking at a page that has 20
03:18:46 2 03:18:47 3 03:18:50 4 03:18:50 5 03:18:53 6 03:18:55 7 03:18:59 8 03:19:06 10 03:19:09 11 03:19:12 12 03:19:15 13 03:19:16 14 03:19:20 15 03:19:49 17 03:19:50 18 03:19:51 19 03:19:51 20 03:19:57 21 03:20:00 22	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed version, Your Honor. I don't know why THE COURT: Probably a lot of last-minute changes.  All right. So, you were directing me to 8.4; is that right, or 8.41? MS. MORRISON: Yes, 8.4.1 is the first place I would direct Your Honor. That Section 8.4 is entitled "Demand Forecast Plans." THE COURT: Right. And then, because I'm working on the assumption that if it's not in yellow, I can say it out loud, 8.4.1 is "Details." MS. MORRISON: Correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: And hold on. Let me just read it for a minute. So, are you expecting there to be numbers of some kind in these paragraphs? MS. MORRISON: Your Honor, it's very difficult for me to tell because in the fully redacted version, it simply has an asterisk. Your Honor can't see that from here. I apologize. I don't know why I'm holding it up. But it simply has an asterisk.	03.22.33 03.22.35 03.22.41 03.22.42 03.22.46 03.22.57 03.23.01 03.23.06 03.23.09 03.23.15 03.23.21 03.23.21 03.23.22 03.23.23 03.23.23 03.23.26 03.23.27 03.23.28 03.23.27 03.23.28 03.23.27 03.23.28	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	projections in them.  THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those projections, are those things that your damages expert used?  MS. MORRISON: Yes.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'd have to say, looking at 8.4.1A and B, I have difficulty thinking that those help any. They certainly don't have any numbers in them. So, that's tentatively what I think about that.  Why don't you try another one.  MS. MORRISON: Sure, Your Honor. So, the next one, and I mentioned this earlier, is the Joint Global Development Plan, which is the schedule to the agreement. It's Schedule 4.3.1. So, I expect that will be at the very back, Your Honor, but again, it's not attached to the version that  THE COURT: 4.3.1, "Joint Global Development Plan." I see it.  MS. MORRISON: Yes, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Or, I mean, I see the schedule. Ah, okay. Development Global Development Plan.  Ms. Fernands, I'm looking at a page that has 20 at the bottom in this, what I think is all part of this one

	Case 1:20-cv-01226-RGA Document 179-	1 File	d <del>06/15/23 Page 5 of 15 PageID</del> #:
	<sup>17</sup> 89		
03:26:40 1	about.	03:30:06 1	ask you to produce Pages 20 to 22?
03:26:40 2	THE COURT: Is that something that's been	03:30:11 2	MS. FERNANDS: I hope I'm not arguing against
03:26:42 3	otherwise produced?	03:30:13 3	myself here, because I think it is all irrelevant, but yes,
03:26:43 4	MS. FERNANDS: I think, to the extent that type	03:30:16 4	if you were to think that any of it is relevant, everything
03:26:49 5	of information has come to fruition in reality, it is		up to Page 20 should not be included.
_	reported in the 10Ks.	_	MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, I guess just to respond to that, we're operating from a place of lack of
	THE COURT: So, it does seem that there's certainly costs and expenses on that in the next couple of		knowledge. So, what Sarepta believes is relevant may be
03:27:52 10	pages that are probably, in some at least general sense, relevant to expected profits down the road; right?	03:30:32 9	different than what Regenxbio believes is relevant. And so, we don't see the there's a Protective Order in this case.
03:27:52 10	MS. FERNANDS: I think to the extent any of this	03:30:41 11	We would agree that no one but the lawyers at Fish &
03:27:58 12	is relevant, it would be captured in the adopted and	03:30:45 12	Richardson and the lawyers for Penn would be able to see
03:28:03 13	approved projections that were produced. I don't think this	03:30:48 13	this agreement. That would be it.
03:28:10 14	instance this and sort of this cost information, I	03:30:49 14	So, there's not a commercial risk to Sarepta to
03:28:10 14	think, does not contain the types of projections that I	03:30:49 14	letting us look at this and determine whether there's things
03:28:14 15	understand Ms. Morrison to be expecting, which I think is	03:30:52 13	in there that our damages expert thinks are relevant. We
03:28:18 17	sort of more of the sales and a sales-type projection which	03:30:59 17	can deal with the commercial risk, but there's little or no
03:28:26 18	I don't think is at all in this document and that we have	03:31:03 18	risk to allowing us to see the agreement to Sarepta.
03:28:29 19	produced, again, through the adopted and approved	03:31:08 19	THE COURT: Okay. So, what's your third choice?
03:28:33 20	projections.	03:31:11 20	MS. MORRISON: So, let me see. The other one is
03:28:34 21	THE COURT: Ms. Morrison.	03:31:26 21	also there's also another schedule that several sections
03:28:34 22	MS. MORRISON: I think what we're looking for is	03:31:34 22	of the agreement refer to. It's Schedule 1.263. And it's
03:28:37 23	any information that goes to Sarepta's sort of, for lack of	03:31:43 23	entitled
03:28:42 24	a better word, state of mind at the time of the hypothetical	03:31:43 24	THE COURT: Okay. Right. I think it's I saw
03:28:46 25	negotiation. I, obviously, haven't seen this document.	03:31:46 25	it while I was leafing through trying to find the one we
	18		20
03:28:49 1	It's completely missing from the public version.	03:31:49 1	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule
03:28:52 2	But to the extent it has any sort of projection	03:31:52 2	isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.
03:28:55 3	about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm	03:31:54 3	MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.
03:29:03 4	operating from a place of lack of knowledge because I	03:31:55 4	THE COURT: But I've got it here. Let me just
03:29:06 5	haven't seen the document. But that might be relevant to	03:31:58 5	see whether I've got the first page of it.
03:29:11 6	our damages analysis because it would be relevant to what	03:32:01 6	MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, the reason we
03:29:14 7	Sarepta would be willing to pay to get a license from	03:32:03 7	think it might be relevant is there's definitions throughout
03:29:19	Regenxbio.	03:32:06	the agreement of commercial supply agreement, development
03:29:19	And so, without being able to see the document,	03:32:10	supply agreement and supply agreements that refer to this
03:29:23 10	I can't fully answer Your Honor's questions.	03:32:14 10	schedule as containing corresponding quantity agreements.
03:29:27 11	THE COURT: Okay. All right.	03:32:19 11	THE COURT: Hold on just a minute.
03:29:32 12	So, let's just hold that thought. Give me a	03:32:23 12	MS. MORRISON: Excuse me. I misspoke.
03:29:35 13	third one.	03:32:25 13	Corresponding quality agreements fulfilling the requirements
03:29:36 14	MS. FERNANDS: Before we move on, may I speak to	03:32:28 14	and so on.
03:29:40 15	the rest of that, Your Honor, because I think	03:32:49 15	THE COURT: Yeah, on the surface, I don't see
03:29:41 16	THE COURT: Sure.	03:32:58 16	much here.
03:29:41 17	MS. FERNANDS: even if you're looking at	03:33:09 17	All right. So, why don't we do this. Why don't
03:29:43 18	starting at Page 20, which I would argue they have	03:33:13 18	we just take a short break, all right, and I'll be back.
03:29:46 19	information, to the extent relevant in other ways,	03:33:16 19	DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
03:29:48 20	everything up to Page 20, I think even from a cursory	03:33:17 20	(Recess was taken.)
03:29:50 21	review, you can see has nothing to do with financials. And	03:45:30 21	DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
03:29:54 22	I would so, clearly not relevant to what we're talking	03:45:32 22	THE COURT: All right. Be seated.
03:29:59 23	about here for purposes of damages.	03:45:35 23	So, part of what's public in here seemed to me
03:30:00 24	THE COURT: Well, so what is your point here?	03:45:47 24	to be well, actually, let me just ask.
03:30:02 25	That if I go wild and ask you to produce this, I should just	03:45:51 <b>25</b>	Ms. Morrison, you said your expert used this in

Filed 06/15/23 Page 6 of 15 PageID # 8983 1 1 03:45:59 their opening report. Can you give me some hint as what 03:48:57 MS. MORRISON: Perhaps Ms. Fernands can correct 2 they were using as public information? What sort of things 03:48:58 2 me if I've gotten the science wrong there, but that does not 03:46:12 3 have anything to do with the cultured host cells in this 03:46:15 3 were they using in the unredacted portions? 03:49:02 4 4 MS. MORRISON: So, I think I can give you a case. 03:49:05 5 5 general idea of what he was using. In general, he was using And I believe the same is true for the 03:49:05 03:46:24 6 03:46:29 6 the portions of -- the unredacted portions that he could see 03:49:07 gene-editing piece. Neither of those are related to the 7 to describe what Sarepta's position would have been at the 7 cultured host cells. 03:49:12 03:46:34 8 03:46:39 8 time of the hypothetical negotiation. 03:49:13 THE COURT: So, the things in the agreement that 9 So, in other words, they had just made this very 9 talk about, for lack of a better word, progress payments for 03:46:41 03:49:15 10 large deal with Roche. They would have been looking forward 03:49:34 10 various milestones, is your expert able to tell that one of 03:46:43 11 to certain payments and milestones based on the deal with 03:49:42 11 these is the SRP one as opposed to the other ones? 03:46:46 12 Roche. We don't have the full scope of that because I think 03:49:48 12 MS. MORRISON: So, I'm not a hundred percent 03:46:50 03:46:53 13 03:49:50 13 perhaps some of it is in the parts that are missing exactly sure. I believe our understanding is that at least that 14 03:49:55 14 03:46:56 what was coming forward. upfront payment was for -- related to the development of 03:46:58 15 03:50:00 15 But the expert's theory, at a high level -- and SRP-9001 using the patented cultured host cells, but I 16 please don't hold me to this, Your Honor, if I don't have it 03:50:05 16 believe we're missing some of the information. I believe. 03:47:02 03:50:08 17 17 exactly right. I am certainly not an economist. But that And, again, Your Honor, I may not have this 03:47:06 03:47:10 18 Sarepta at the time of the hypothetical negotiation would 03:50:10 18 exactly right, but to be able to delineate that exactly 03:47:13 19 03:50:14 19 have effectively had two choices. because some of that information is redacted, I believe. 03:47:16 20 03:50:18 20 They could have either taken a license and But, again, I can't see what's redacted. 03:47:18 21 continued with development because their product required 03:50:20 21 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 03:47:21 22 the patented cultured host cell -- in order to continue the 03:50:22 22 Is there anything more you want to say, 03:47:24 23 development, they needed the patented cultured host cells, 03:50:24 23 Ms. Fernands? 03:47:28 24 03:50:24 24 or they would have had to stop and wait for the patent to MS. FERNANDS: I think to the extent the expert 03:47:31 **25** 03:50:27 25 expire is relying on this, there is -- the upfronts, as you said, 22 1 And so, what would they have been thinking 1 were public. To the extent that any other payment gets made 03:47:32 03:50:30 2 about? And the Roche agreement formed part of that of what 2 in the future, that would be reported. None have been. 03:50:33 03:47:33 3 they would have been thinking about in considering the cost 3 03:47:37 03:50:37 And their expert has not relied on this as being 4 it would have been to stop that development. 4 comparable. So, I don't think the details of the specific, 03:50:42 03:47:39 5 03:47:41 THE COURT: So, there's a very large number that 03:50:45 5 whether it be a percentage or the milestone for a particular 6 appears to be unredacted as kind of like the upfront 6 event, would be relevant because this is not relied on as a 03:47:44 03:50:49 7 7 comparable license. It's relied on for Sarepta's state of payment; right? Is that part of --03:50:52 03:47:48 8 8 03:50:55 MS. MORRISON: That's part of what he relied on, mind which, again, I think that the projections that we 03:47:50 9 yes, Your Honor. 9 provided would provide that information without having to 03:50:58 03:47:52 03:47:52 10 03:51:01 10 THE COURT: And the agreement, is it the case, produce this agreement. 11 your understanding, your expert's understanding, that large 03:51:02 11 MS. MORRISON: We, obviously, don't agree, Your 03:48:03 12 number, when it's talking about gene splicing or exon, are 03:51:10 12 Honor, or we wouldn't be here asking for production of the 03:48:09 13 those things that grow out of, in your theory, you know, the 03:51:12 13 agreement. At least that there is a reasonable likelihood 03:48:15 14 use of your cultured cells or are they just completely --03:51:15 14 that there are things in there that are relevant to 03:48:21 03:48:24 15 03:51:18 15 MS. MORRISON: No. Sarepta's state of mind that would inform the hypothetical 16 THE COURT: -- things that Sarepta has free 03:51:23 16 negotiation. 03:48:24 ns:48:30 17 03:51:23 17 license to, you know, make as much money as they can from THE COURT: Okay. And so, the big number, the 18 it? 03:51:50 18 upfront payment, which I believe is three-quarters of a 19 MS. MORRISON: If I understand it correctly, 03:51:54 19 billion dollars, maybe that's not big in the pharmaceutical 03:48:35 03:48:38 20 Your Honor, the exon-skipping drug -- Sarepta has a marketed 03:51:57 20 world, but it seems big to me. Your belief is that that is 03:48:43 21 product that does not use the cultured host cells and is not 03:52:06 21 basically for the access to the SRP materials; right? 03:48:47 22 implicated in this case that is used to treat Duchenne n3-52-14 22 MS. MORRISON: Yes, the SRP-9001 made using the 03:48:54 23 03:52:17 23 Muscular Dystrophy that is -- it's called an exon-skipping cultured host cells. 03:48:56 24 03:52:19 24 drua. THE COURT: And your expert, his calculations 03:48:56 25 THE COURT: Okay. 03:52:31 25 here, I suppose, are for a reasonable royalty?

	Case 1:20-cv-01226-RGA Document 179-		d 06/15/23 Page 7 of 15 PageID #:
03:52:35 1	MS. MORRISON: Yeah, it's for a lump sum payment	84 03:55:28 <b>1</b>	MS. MORRISON: Well, so it would be factored
03:52:37	that the parties would have agreed to, but yes, it's not a	03:55:30 2	into how much they pay. And, Your Honor, it's difficult for
03:52:40 3	lost profits analysis. It's a reasonable royalty analysis	03:55:32 3	me to again, I'm not an economist, but essentially our
03:52:42 4	under Georgia-Pacific.	03:55:36 4	expert's damages number or his model looks at: What is the
03:52:43 5	THE COURT: And does the amount of money that	03:55:42 5	value of that 35 months to Sarepta and what is the value of
03:52:45	changed hands in this agreement play into that reasonable	03:55:45	that 35 months to Regenxbio? And how would they come into
03:52:50 7	royalty analysis in a quantitative way?	03:55:49 7	this and bargain between them to divide that value
03:52:55	MS. MORRISON: It does, Your Honor, only in	03:55:53	effectively?
03:52:57	that not in the sense that our expert certainly is not	03:55:54	And so, if there are more payments in this
03:53:02 10	saying, well, Sarepta is going to get paid "X" dollars by	03:55:57 10	agreement that Sarepta would receive during that 35 months,
03:53:05 11	Roche, and so they would have paid "Y" dollars. It's not	03:56:01 11	that would add to the value of the license to Regenxbio.
03:53:08 12	that direct.	03:56:06 12	And I'm sure that our damages expert could explain this far
03:53:09 13	But it's a and, again, I don't want to	03:56:10 13	better than I can, because I'm not an economist, and he'll
03:53:13 14	misquote. I don't have his report memorized. But it goes	03:56:13 14	have graphs and models, to the extent that we get that far
03:53:17 15	to several things.	03:56:17 15	in this case. But it would factor into the value of the
03:53:18 16	It goes to Sarepta's state of mind as to the	03:56:23 16	license to Sarepta.
03:53:21 17	value of the market as to what they would be leaving on the	03:56:45 17	THE COURT: What is your expert's bottom line
03:53:24 18	table if they didn't take a license. And so, how much the	03:56:50 18	lump sum number at this point?
03:53:28 19	license was worth to them.	03:56:52 19	MS. MORRISON: I'm going to misquote it, Your
03:53:30 20	It goes to at least those sorts of issues, but	03:56:55 20	Honor, but it's approximately it's just a little over
03:53:33 21	it's not a direct quote.	03:56:58 21	. Because he valued that delay and something
03:53:35 22	THE COURT: Well, I guess what I'm wondering is	03:57:06 22	again, I'm not going to get the number right, but the value
03:53:42 23	so, if there are, you know, progress payments you know,	03:57:08 23	of that delay to Sarepta that if they had to wait the
03:53:45 24	let's say, just hypothetically here, but somewhere in this	03:57:12 24	35 months, it would have been on the order of
03:53:52 <b>25</b>	agreement it says, Okay, and there will be \$10 million every	03:57:16 <b>25</b>	I'm forgetting, but it was
	26		28
03:54:00 1	month, you know, for the next five years, or it says \$5	03:57:19 1	, the loss Sarepta would have incurred if they had
03:54:05 2	million, or it says a hundred million dollars, how is that	03:57:23 2	had to wait, according to his models.
03:54:08 3	going to affect anything?	03:57:26	I'm quite sure Sarepta will disagree with that
03:54:10 4	MS. MORRISON: So, I think what it would impact,	03:57:28 4	valuation.
03:54:12 <b>5</b>	Your Honor, is, again, I can only talk in hypotheticals	03:57:28 <b>5</b>	THE COURT: Yeah, I think that's a reasonable
03:54:16	because I can't see the agreement. But if there were, for	03:57:30 6	certainty.
03:54:19 7	example, a provision that said there's going to be a	03:57:30 7	MS. MORRISON: Yeah.
03:54:22	progress payment of \$10 million for every month so long as	03:57:58	THE COURT: So, does your economist write at
03:54:27	you, Sarepta, are actually making progress towards	03:58:00	this point, have sort of like a range of values based on, I
03:54:30 10	developing SRP-9001, without a license, excuse me, to the	03:58:11 10	don't know, how much they were expecting to get paid over
03:54:35 11	patented cultured host cell, our damages theory is Sarepta	03:58:13 11	the 35 months? I mean, do you have any information at all
03:54:39 12	would have had to stop development and wait for the patent	03:58:18 12	about other than the upfront lump sum, is there any other
03:54:42 13	to expire, which is a term of about 35 months.	03:58:22 13	public information as to what's in the agreement, or do you
03:54:45 14	And so, Sarepta would be thinking, Well, if we	03:58:26 14	have any other information about how much revenue this was
03:54:48 15	don't take this license, we're going to lose 35 months of	03:58:31 15	supposed to generate?
03:54:51 16	\$10 million a month, and that's really valuable to us. And	03:58:32 16	MS. MORRISON: Yes, from Sarepta's projections,
03:54:55 17	so, it would go into how Sarepta is valuing that license	03:58:34 17	we do.
03:54:59 18	THE COURT: Right.	03:58:35 18	THE COURT: Uh-huh.
03:54:59 19	MS. MORRISON: if there were such a	03:58:40 19	MS. MORRISON: But I have no way of knowing
03:55:01 20	provision.	03:58:42 20	whether those projections include those projections are
03:55:01 21	THE COURT: But, you know, once you've said	03:58:46 21	Sarepta's at least my understanding of them is they are
03:55:06 22	\$750 million, you know, whether it's over the next 35 months	03:58:48 22	Sarepta's own U.S. sales. I don't know that they include
03:55:12 23	another \$750 million or whether it's, you know, a mere \$100	03:58:54 23	at least my understanding of them is that they do not
1	million, or if that's not being factored into how much they pay, what difference does it make?	03:58:57 24	include these kind of payments from Roche.  And so, that would be additional value that
03:55:26 25	DAY WORLD DITTORONGO GOOD IF MAYOU	I 03:50:01 / 3	And so that would be additional value that

1	Case 1:20-cv-01226-RGA Document 179-		d 06/15/23 Page 8 of 15 PageID #:
03:59:04 1	Sarepta potential if there is, as Your Honor	85 04:01:49 <b>1</b>	Mr. Estepan's deposition.
	,	04:01:49	
١ .	hypothesized, a provision that would require Sarepta to make	١ .	THE COURT: All right. As much fun as this is
_	progress in order to earn additional payments, that is not		for the two of you, Ms. Fernands, Page 69, there's
_	currently accounted for in our damages model, because we are	_	Table 9.4.1 that's called "Lead Product Regulatory
	unaware of such payments. And that is not the Sarepta		Milestones." That's in the public version.
_	forecasts are based on their own U.S. sales.  THE COURT: Do you have any comment on that,	_	Is the lead product here SRP-9001?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, Your Honor.
	Ms. Fernands?	_	
03:59:31 8			THE COURT: And the public version says,
03:59:32 9	MS. FERNANDS: I believe the forecasts I	04:02:20 9	"Achievement of lead product regulatory milestone event,"
03:59:38 11	don't know if that's entirely accurate, and I believe that	04:02:23 10	and then there's some redacted information. And part of the redacted information doesn't provide based on various events
03:59:38 11	the forecasts have tabs for a variety of issues, including a	04:02:29 11	·
03:59:46 12	Roche tab, although I cannot speak to the details of what is in that tab. But I do know that that tab is in the	04:02:38 12	or what seem like decently large numbers of payments.  Why isn't that relevant information?
03:59:49 13		04:02:48 13	
03:59:51 14	projections that were produced.	04:02:51 14	MS. FERNANDS: I think, again, that isn't
03:59:52 16	I don't think I think what I'm hearing is a	04:02:53 13	relevant information because let's just step back. This is about the final products, ex-US, and not about cultured host
03:59:55 10	lot of the agreement might, which is a lot of speculation	04:02:56 10	
04:00:04 18	where what we have is it is definitely not asserted that	04:03:03 17	cells.  And so, just to start on the broadest brush
04:00:04 10	it's comparable, and they know the general overall value	04:03:08 19	' '
04:00:08 19	from public information. So, the details are not relevant.	04:03:08 19	strokes, this agreement should not be relevant to damages.
l	MS. MORRISON: And, again, Your Honor, we just	04:03:11 20	To the extent it's relevant to damages as the larger picture
04:00:17 21	disagree, and I think Rule 26, right, does not require that	04:03:16 21	that their only argument is that it's Sarepta's state of
04:00:22 22	the information that we're seeking during discovery ends up	04:03:20 22	mind about continuing development and what that value is for
04:00:26 23	being admissible as evidence or that we necessarily have to	04:03:23 23	which Sarepta's projections should be adequate.
04:00:30 24	rely on it. And the reason I'm saying might is because, of course, I haven't seen these provisions because Sarepta has	04:03:28 24	These details about what would be paid for ex-US activities for the final products are far removed from the
04.00.33	30	04:03:32	32
04:00:36 1	refused to produce them.	04:03:36 1	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that
04:00:39 2	And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be	04:03:41 2	Sarepta would be infringing.
04:00:43 3	attempting to hold us to a standard of we have to show that	l _	
		04:04:01 3	MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if
04:00:46	the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible		MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if
04:00:46 4	the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can	04:04:03 4	you
_	or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can	04:04:03 4	
04:00:50 5	or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at	04:04:03 <b>4</b> 04:04:03 <b>5</b>	you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy
04:00:50 <b>5</b>	or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can	04:04:03 <b>4</b> 04:04:03 <b>5</b> 04:04:12 <b>6</b>	you THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts
04:00:50 <b>5</b> 04:00:53 <b>6</b> 04:00:56 <b>7</b>	or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple	04:04:03 <b>4</b> 04:04:03 <b>5</b> 04:04:12 <b>6</b> 04:04:20 <b>7</b>	you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?
04:00:50 <b>5</b> 04:00:53 <b>6</b> 04:00:56 <b>7</b> 04:01:00 <b>8</b>	or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our	04:04:03 <b>4</b> 04:04:03 <b>5</b> 04:04:12 <b>6</b> 04:04:20 <b>7</b> 04:04:29 <b>8</b>	you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think
04:00:50 <b>5</b> 04:00:53 <b>6</b> 04:00:56 <b>7</b> 04:01:00 <b>8</b> 04:01:04 <b>9</b>	or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert	04:04:03	you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think that's right.
04:00:50 <b>5</b> 04:00:53 <b>6</b> 04:00:56 <b>7</b> 04:01:00 <b>8</b> 04:01:04 <b>9</b> 04:01:07 <b>10</b>	or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.	04:04:03	you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's
04:00:50 5 04:00:53 6 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:04 9 04:01:07 10 04:01:08 11	or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the	04:04:03	you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's defined. I believe that might be relevant because the
04:00:50 5 04:00:53 6 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:04 9 04:01:07 10 04:01:08 11 04:01:11 12	or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really	04:04:03	THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's defined. I believe that might be relevant because the accused cultured host cells are used to make more than
04:00:50 5 04:00:53 6 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:04 9 04:01:07 10 04:01:08 11 04:01:11 12 04:01:13 13	or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's	04:04:03	THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's defined. I believe that might be relevant because the accused cultured host cells are used to make more than SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products
04:00:50 5 04:00:53 6 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:04 9 04:01:07 10 04:01:08 11 04:01:11 12 04:01:13 13 04:01:17 14	or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's certainly relevant to the damages issues.	04:04:03	THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's defined. I believe that might be relevant because the accused cultured host cells are used to make more than SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products by Sarepta. And so, perhaps those would also be relevant.
04:00:50 5 04:00:53 6 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:04 9 04:01:07 10 04:01:08 11 04:01:11 12 04:01:13 13 04:01:17 14 04:01:19 15	or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's certainly relevant to the damages issues.  MS. FERNANDS: I don't believe that either of	04:04:03	THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's defined. I believe that might be relevant because the accused cultured host cells are used to make more than SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products by Sarepta. And so, perhaps those would also be relevant.  But I would agree with you on gene editing and
04:00:50 5 04:00:53 6 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:07 10 04:01:08 11 04:01:11 12 04:01:13 13 04:01:17 14 04:01:19 15 04:01:20 16	or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's certainly relevant to the damages issues.  MS. FERNANDS: I don't believe that either of the interrogatory responses or the damages report asserts	04:04:03	THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's defined. I believe that might be relevant because the accused cultured host cells are used to make more than SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products by Sarepta. And so, perhaps those would also be relevant.  But I would agree with you on gene editing and exon skipping, those are not relevant.
04:00:50 5 04:00:53 6 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:04 9 04:01:07 10 04:01:08 11 04:01:11 12 04:01:13 13 04:01:17 14 04:01:19 15 04:01:20 16 04:01:23 17	or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's certainly relevant to the damages issues.  MS. FERNANDS: I don't believe that either of the interrogatory responses or the damages report asserts this as a comparable license.	04:04:03	THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's defined. I believe that might be relevant because the accused cultured host cells are used to make more than SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products by Sarepta. And so, perhaps those would also be relevant.  But I would agree with you on gene editing and exon skipping, those are not relevant.  THE COURT: All right. Okay.
04:00:50 5 04:00:53 6 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:07 10 04:01:07 10 04:01:11 12 04:01:11 13 04:01:17 14 04:01:19 15 04:01:23 17 04:01:24 18	or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's certainly relevant to the damages issues.  MS. FERNANDS: I don't believe that either of the interrogatory responses or the damages report asserts this as a comparable license.  MS. MORRISON: Interrogatory 17, which asks for	04:04:03	THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's defined. I believe that might be relevant because the accused cultured host cells are used to make more than SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products by Sarepta. And so, perhaps those would also be relevant.  But I would agree with you on gene editing and exon skipping, those are not relevant.  THE COURT: All right. Okay. Well, so here's what I'm going to do. With the
04:00:50 5 04:00:53 6 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:04 9 04:01:07 10 04:01:08 11 04:01:11 12 04:01:13 13 04:01:17 14 04:01:19 15 04:01:23 17 04:01:24 18 04:01:28 19	or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's certainly relevant to the damages issues.  MS. FERNANDS: I don't believe that either of the interrogatory responses or the damages report asserts this as a comparable license.  MS. MORRISON: Interrogatory 17, which asks for comparable licenses, this response was or, excuse me, this	04:04:03	THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's defined. I believe that might be relevant because the accused cultured host cells are used to make more than SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products by Sarepta. And so, perhaps those would also be relevant.  But I would agree with you on gene editing and exon skipping, those are not relevant.  THE COURT: All right. Okay.  Well, so here's what I'm going to do. With the understanding that this agreement is Attorneys' Eyes Only,
04:00:50 5 04:00:53 6 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:04 9 04:01:07 10 04:01:08 11 04:01:11 12 04:01:13 13 04:01:17 14 04:01:19 15 04:01:20 16 04:01:23 17 04:01:24 18 04:01:28 19 04:01:33 20	or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's certainly relevant to the damages issues.  MS. FERNANDS: I don't believe that either of the interrogatory responses or the damages report asserts this as a comparable license.  MS. MORRISON: Interrogatory 17, which asks for comparable licenses, this response was or, excuse me, this document was cited in Interrogatory Number 17.	04:04:03	THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's defined. I believe that might be relevant because the accused cultured host cells are used to make more than SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products by Sarepta. And so, perhaps those would also be relevant.  But I would agree with you on gene editing and exon skipping, those are not relevant.  THE COURT: All right. Okay.  Well, so here's what I'm going to do. With the understanding that this agreement is Attorneys' Eyes Only, which I take it must include the expert, I'm going to order
04:00:50 5 04:00:53 6 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:07 10 04:01:08 11 04:01:11 12 04:01:13 13 04:01:17 14 04:01:19 15 04:01:23 17 04:01:24 18 04:01:28 19 04:01:33 20 04:01:37 21	or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's certainly relevant to the damages issues.  MS. FERNANDS: I don't believe that either of the interrogatory responses or the damages report asserts this as a comparable license.  MS. MORRISON: Interrogatory 17, which asks for comparable licenses, this response was or, excuse me, this document was cited in Interrogatory Number 17.  Now, again	04:04:03	THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's defined. I believe that might be relevant because the accused cultured host cells are used to make more than SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products by Sarepta. And so, perhaps those would also be relevant.  But I would agree with you on gene editing and exon skipping, those are not relevant.  THE COURT: All right. Okay.  Well, so here's what I'm going to do. With the understanding that this agreement is Attorneys' Eyes Only, which I take it must include the expert, I'm going to order its production. I do so because I think, based on what I've
04:00:50 5 04:00:53 6 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:04 9 04:01:07 10 04:01:08 11 04:01:11 12 04:01:13 13 04:01:17 14 04:01:20 16 04:01:23 17 04:01:24 18 04:01:28 19 04:01:33 20 04:01:37 21	or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's certainly relevant to the damages issues.  MS. FERNANDS: I don't believe that either of the interrogatory responses or the damages report asserts this as a comparable license.  MS. MORRISON: Interrogatory 17, which asks for comparable licenses, this response was or, excuse me, this document was cited in Interrogatory Number 17.  Now, again  MS. FERNANDS: Well, what is the Bates number	04:04:03	THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's defined. I believe that might be relevant because the accused cultured host cells are used to make more than SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products by Sarepta. And so, perhaps those would also be relevant.  But I would agree with you on gene editing and exon skipping, those are not relevant.  THE COURT: All right. Okay.  Well, so here's what I'm going to do. With the understanding that this agreement is Attorneys' Eyes Only, which I take it must include the expert, I'm going to order its production. I do so because I think, based on what I've heard, that the lead product regulatory information that's

1	<del>- Case 1:20-cv-01226-RGA - Document 179-</del> :		d <del>06/15/23 Page 9 of 15 PageID #:</del>
	33 89		35
04:06:16 1	you know, are not direct evidence of value of the cultured	04:10:29 1	what has been redacted. And so, basically the dollar
04:06:23 2	cells or the production method, you know, there's both	04:10:36 2	figures for these things that are not the lead product or
04:06:31 3	quantitative and qualitative.	04:10:44 3	the gene therapy product, yeah, you can do that, but
04:06:33 4	And it may be that some of this is similar or	04:10:49 4	otherwise, you ought to give over a clean agreement.
04:06:37 5	different, I don't know, to the actual to the projections	04:10:54 5	Okay?
04:06:46 6	that were made. Maybe the projections should be roughly the	04:10:54 6	MS. FERNANDS: May I ask, and I hope this won't
04:06:50 7	same because well, you would think they would be somewhat	04:10:56 7	be controversial, schedule 11.6.2 is a Roche internal
04:06:56	close.	04:11:01 8	document concerning Roche compliance policies. It's a
04:06:56 9	But I think that for an expert to be relying on	04:11:05 9	rather long document. It is I think there's I think
04:07:04 10	a license, even for state of mind, it's a big handicap not	04:11:10 10	it's listed in the 11.6.2 is listed in the public version
04:07:11 11	to have the entire agreement available to him so that he can	04:11:15 11	of schedules, I think. But, Your Honor, you can see in the
04:07:21 12	decide what there is in it that is relevant to his	04:11:18 12	version that you have that it is a document with a Roche
04:07:28 13	undertaking.	04:11:22 13	header.
04:07:29 14	And, you know, I think the lead it seems to	04:11:22 14	THE COURT: It's 100 percent redacted; right?
04:07:35 15	me at least reasonable to say that the lead product	04:11:25 15	MS. FERNANDS: It was 100 percent redacted.
04:07:38 16	information is relevant to his undertaking, which is partly	04:11:27 16	Only the title was in the public.
04:07:44 17	based on the fact that in the expert report, he's managed to	04:11:28 17	THE COURT: It seems
04:07:51 18	use the agreement as part of his support for his opinions.	04:11:34 18	MS. MORRISON: Without having seen it, it's
04:08:02 19	And so, having a high degree of confidence in	04:11:35 19	difficult for me to say, but I will accept Ms. Fernands'
04:08:09 20	the Confidentiality Order, and I think it should be	04:11:40 20	representation.
04:08:23 21	produced.	04:11:40 21	THE COURT: Well, I mean, just looking at it, I
04:08:25 22	MS. FERNANDS: May we produce in a redacted form	04:11:42 22	mean, it really is like a statement of corporate policy that
04:08:27 23	with the exon skipping and gene editing all removed?	04:11:45 23	has nothing to do with I think this has nothing to do
04:08:31 24	MS. MORRISON: Your Honor, we don't have any	04:11:51 24	with this contract in particular; right?
04:08:32 25	objection to that other than our concern that as long as	04:11:53 25	MS. FERNANDS: That is my understanding, and it
1	34	l	36
	34	l .	30
04:08:36 1	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about	04:11:55 1	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our
04:08:36 <b>1</b> 04:08:39 <b>2</b>		04:11:58 2	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.
	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about	04:11:58 <b>2</b> 04:12:00 <b>3</b>	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand
04:08:39 2	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as	04:11:58 <b>2</b> 04:12:00 <b>3</b> 04:12:02 <b>4</b>	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?
04:08:39 <b>2</b> 04:08:41 <b>3</b>	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as THE COURT: Okay.	04:11:58 <b>2</b> 04:12:00 <b>3</b> 04:12:02 <b>4</b> 04:12:08 <b>5</b>	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to
04:08:39 <b>2</b> 04:08:41 <b>3</b> 04:08:41 <b>4</b>	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as THE COURT: Okay. MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going	04:11:58 <b>2</b> 04:12:00 <b>3</b> 04:12:02 <b>4</b> 04:12:08 <b>5</b> 04:12:11 <b>6</b>	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions
04:08:39 <b>2</b> 04:08:41 <b>3</b> 04:08:41 <b>4</b> 04:08:43 <b>5</b>	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as THE COURT: Okay. MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete	04:11:58 <b>2</b> 04:12:00 <b>3</b> 04:12:02 <b>4</b> 04:12:08 <b>5</b> 04:12:11 <b>6</b> 04:12:15 <b>7</b>	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and
04:08:39 <b>2</b> 04:08:41 <b>3</b> 04:08:41 <b>4</b> 04:08:43 <b>5</b> 04:08:47 <b>6</b>	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?
04:08:39 <b>2</b> 04:08:41 <b>3</b> 04:08:41 <b>4</b> 04:08:43 <b>5</b> 04:08:47 <b>6</b> 04:08:52 <b>7</b> 04:08:54 <b>8</b> 04:08:56 <b>9</b>	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but	04:11:58 <b>2</b> 04:12:00 <b>3</b> 04:12:02 <b>4</b> 04:12:08 <b>5</b> 04:12:11 <b>6</b> 04:12:15 <b>7</b> 04:12:20 <b>8</b> 04:12:23 <b>9</b>	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce
04:08:39 2 04:08:41 3 04:08:41 4 04:08:43 5 04:08:47 6 04:08:52 7 04:08:54 8 04:08:56 9 04:09:00 10	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me,	04:11:58 <b>2</b> 04:12:00 <b>3</b> 04:12:02 <b>4</b> 04:12:08 <b>5</b> 04:12:11 <b>6</b> 04:12:15 <b>7</b> 04:12:20 <b>8</b> 04:12:23 <b>9</b> 04:12:26 <b>10</b>	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.
04:08:39 2 04:08:41 3 04:08:41 4 04:08:43 5 04:08:47 6 04:08:52 7 04:08:54 8 04:08:56 9 04:09:00 10 04:09:09 11	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules,	04:11:58 <b>2</b> 04:12:00 <b>3</b> 04:12:02 <b>4</b> 04:12:08 <b>5</b> 04:12:11 <b>6</b> 04:12:15 <b>7</b> 04:12:20 <b>8</b> 04:12:23 <b>9</b>	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce
04:08:39 2 04:08:41 3 04:08:41 4 04:08:43 5 04:08:47 6 04:08:52 7 04:08:54 8 04:08:56 9 04:09:00 10 04:09:09 11 04:09:01 12	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an
04:08:39 2 04:08:41 3 04:08:41 4 04:08:43 5 04:08:47 6 04:08:52 7 04:08:54 8 04:08:56 9 04:09:00 10 04:09:01 11 04:09:11 12 04:09:16 13	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.
04:08:39 2 04:08:41 3 04:08:41 4 04:08:43 5 04:08:47 6 04:08:52 7 04:08:54 8 04:08:56 9 04:09:09 11 04:09:01 12 04:09:11 12 04:09:19 14	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.
04:08:39 2 04:08:41 3 04:08:41 4 04:08:43 5 04:08:47 6 04:08:52 7 04:08:54 8 04:08:56 9 04:09:00 10 04:09:01 12 04:09:16 13 04:09:19 14 04:09:12 15	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest goes to what I'd say technical or clinical.	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
04:08:39 2 04:08:41 3 04:08:41 4 04:08:43 5 04:08:47 6 04:08:52 7 04:08:54 8 04:08:56 9 04:09:09 11 04:09:01 12 04:09:16 13 04:09:19 14 04:09:22 15 04:09:29 16	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  THE COURT: The transcript will serve as my
04:08:39 2 04:08:41 3 04:08:41 4 04:08:43 5 04:08:47 6 04:08:52 7 04:08:56 9 04:09:09 11 04:09:09 11 04:09:11 12 04:09:19 14 04:09:22 15 04:09:38 17	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest goes to what I'd say technical or clinical.	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  THE COURT: The transcript will serve as my Order.
04:08:39 2 04:08:41 3 04:08:41 4 04:08:43 5 04:08:47 6 04:08:52 7 04:08:54 8 04:08:56 9 04:09:00 10 04:09:01 12 04:09:16 13 04:09:19 14 04:09:22 15 04:09:38 17 04:09:41 18	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest goes to what I'd say technical or clinical.  THE COURT: No, I think the technical and	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  THE COURT: The transcript will serve as my Order.  (Court was recessed at 4:12 p.m.)
04:08:39 2 04:08:41 3 04:08:41 4 04:08:43 5 04:08:47 6 04:08:52 7 04:08:54 8 04:08:56 9 04:09:09 11 04:09:09 11 04:09:11 12 04:09:16 13 04:09:19 14 04:09:22 15 04:09:28 17 04:09:41 18 04:09:46 19	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest goes to what I'd say technical or clinical.  THE COURT: No, I think the technical and clinical, I would think isn't going to make too much	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  THE COURT: The transcript will serve as my Order.  (Court was recessed at 4:12 p.m.)  I hereby certify the foregoing is a true and
04:08:39 2 04:08:41 3 04:08:41 4 04:08:43 5 04:08:47 6 04:08:52 7 04:08:56 9 04:09:00 10 04:09:01 12 04:09:11 12 04:09:16 13 04:09:19 14 04:09:22 15 04:09:28 17 04:09:41 18 04:09:41 18 04:09:49 20	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest goes to what I'd say technical or clinical.  THE COURT: No, I think the technical and clinical, I would think isn't going to make too much difference to a damages expert because I'm assuming he's	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  THE COURT: The transcript will serve as my Order.  (Court was recessed at 4:12 p.m.)  I hereby certify the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript from my stenographic notes in the
04:08:39 2 04:08:41 3 04:08:41 4 04:08:43 5 04:08:47 6 04:08:52 7 04:08:54 8 04:08:56 9 04:09:09 11 04:09:09 11 04:09:11 12 04:09:16 13 04:09:19 14 04:09:22 15 04:09:28 17 04:09:41 18 04:09:46 19	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest goes to what I'd say technical or clinical.  THE COURT: No, I think the technical and clinical, I would think isn't going to make too much difference to a damages expert because I'm assuming he's probably not a whole lot better qualified than me to make	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  THE COURT: The transcript will serve as my  Order.  (Court was recessed at 4:12 p.m.)  I hereby certify the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript from my stenographic notes in the proceeding.
04:08:39 2 04:08:41 3 04:08:41 4 04:08:43 5 04:08:47 6 04:08:52 7 04:08:56 9 04:09:00 10 04:09:01 12 04:09:11 12 04:09:16 13 04:09:19 14 04:09:22 15 04:09:28 17 04:09:41 18 04:09:41 18 04:09:49 20	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest goes to what I'd say technical or clinical.  THE COURT: No, I think the technical and clinical, I would think isn't going to make too much difference to a damages expert because I'm assuming he's probably not a whole lot better qualified than me to make sense of it. But I think, you know, basically the redaction	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  THE COURT: The transcript will serve as my Order.  (Court was recessed at 4:12 p.m.)  I hereby certify the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript from my stenographic notes in the proceeding.  /s/ Heather M. Triozzi
04:08:39 2 04:08:41 3 04:08:41 4 04:08:43 5 04:08:47 6 04:08:52 7 04:08:54 8 04:08:56 9 04:09:00 10 04:09:00 11 04:09:11 12 04:09:16 13 04:09:19 14 04:09:22 15 04:09:29 16 04:09:38 17 04:09:41 18 04:09:46 19 04:09:49 20 04:10:05 21	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest goes to what I'd say technical or clinical.  THE COURT: No, I think the technical and clinical, I would think isn't going to make too much difference to a damages expert because I'm assuming he's probably not a whole lot better qualified than me to make sense of it. But I think, you know, basically the redaction of the exon skipping and the gene splicing, everyone agrees	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  THE COURT: The transcript will serve as my  Order.  (Court was recessed at 4:12 p.m.)  I hereby certify the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript from my stenographic notes in the proceeding.  /s/ Heather M. Triozzi Certified Merit and Real-Time Reporter
04:08:39 2 04:08:41 3 04:08:41 4 04:08:43 5 04:08:47 6 04:08:52 7 04:08:54 8 04:08:56 9 04:09:09 11 04:09:09 11 04:09:19 14 04:09:19 14 04:09:22 15 04:09:29 16 04:09:38 17 04:09:41 18 04:09:49 19 04:09:49 20 04:10:05 21	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest goes to what I'd say technical or clinical.  THE COURT: No, I think the technical and clinical, I would think isn't going to make too much difference to a damages expert because I'm assuming he's probably not a whole lot better qualified than me to make sense of it. But I think, you know, basically the redaction of the exon skipping and the gene splicing, everyone agrees those dollars are just irrelevant. And we're not going to	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  THE COURT: The transcript will serve as my  Order.  (Court was recessed at 4:12 p.m.)  I hereby certify the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript from my stenographic notes in the proceeding.  /s/ Heather M. Triozzi Certified Merit and Real-Time Reporter

\$	8	19:13, 19:18, 19:22,	В	certainly [7] - 11:9,
Ψ	0	20:8, 20:9, 22:2,	ь	16:7, 17:8, 21:17,
<b>\$10</b> [3] - 25:25, 26:8,	<b>8.4</b> [3] - 13:16, 14:5,	22:10, 23:8, 24:10,	backup [1] - 4:10	25:9, 30:14, 36:1
26:16	14:8	24:13, 25:6, 25:25,	bad [1] - 6:6	certainty [1] - 28:6
<b>\$100</b> [1] - 26:23	<b>8.4.1</b> [3] - 12:24, 14:7,	26:6, 27:10, 28:13,	bargain [1] - 27:7	Certified [1] - 36:21
<b>\$750</b> [2] - 26:22, 26:23	14:12	29:16, 30:6, 31:19,	based [8] - 9:17,	certify [1] - 36:18
	<b>8.4.1A</b> [1] - 16:6	32:19, 33:11, 33:18,	21:11, 28:9, 29:6,	changed [1] - 25:6
	<b>8.41</b> [1] - 14:6	34:6, 35:4	30:6, 31:11, 32:21,	changes [1] - 14:4
1	<b>8.5</b> [1] - 13:18	agreements [4] -	33:17	check [1] - 15:4
	<b>8.7</b> [1] - 13:19	10:20, 20:9, 20:10,	batch [5] - 3:19, 3:22,	choice [1] - 19:19
/s [1] - 36:21	<b>8.8</b> [1] - 13:16	20:13	4:6, 4:7, 4:10	choices [1] - 21:19
	8.86 [1] - 13:16	agrees [1] - 34:21	batches [2] - 4:3, 6:12	chunk [1] - 4:24
1	<b>844</b> [1] - 1:10	ahead [2] - 7:11, 12:10	Bates [1] - 30:22	cited [5] - 30:7, 30:9,
		<b>al</b> [1] - 2:7	BEFORE [1] - 1:14	30:20, 30:23, 30:24
<b>1.263</b> [1] - 19:22	9	allowing [1] - 19:18	belief [1] - 24:20	clean [2] - 11:20, 35:4
<b>100</b> [2] - 35:14, 35:15		amount [3] - 6:8, 25:5	believes [2] - 19:8,	clear [1] - 34:25
<b>10K</b> [2] - 9:1, 9:2	<b>9.4.1</b> [1] - 31:4	analysis [7] - 9:20,	19:9	clearly [2] - 18:22,
10Ks [1] - 17:6	_	18:6, 25:3, 25:7,	best [2] - 4:17, 12:18	30:11
<b>11.6.2</b> [2] - 35:7, 35:10	Α	30:5, 30:9	better [5] - 12:5,	CLERK [4] - 2:2,
<b>17</b> [2] - 30:18, 30:20	-bl 0.4 40.0	ANASTASIA [1] - 1:22	17:24, 23:9, 27:13,	20:19, 20:21, 36:14
	<b>able</b> [7] - 9:4, 18:9,	Andrews [1] - 2:3	34:19	client [3] - 2:8, 4:8, 6:1
2	19:12, 23:10, 23:18,	ANDREWS [1] - 1:14	between [3] - 7:19,	client's [1] - 36:1
<b>2</b> [1] - 1:11	36:5, 36:9	answer [5] - 7:2, 7:6,	27:7, 32:25	clinical [6] - 4:17,
<b>20</b> [5] - 16:21, 18:18,	accept [1] - 35:19	7:7, 13:21, 18:10	big [4] - 24:17, 24:19,	4:20, 5:6, 6:13,
18:20, 19:1, 19:5	access [1] - 24:21	apologize [1] - 14:21	24:20, 33:10	34:15, 34:17
20-1226-RGA [1] - 1:5	according [1] - 28:2 account [3] - 5:19,	APPEARANCES [1] -	billion [1] - 24:19	clinicals [2] - 5:8, 6:16
<b>2012</b> [1] - 4:4	5:20, 7:4	1:15		close [2] - 9:9, 33:8
2023 [1] - 1:11	accounted [2] - 6:8,	approval [2] - 4:18, 4:20	BLA [1] - 4:18	closest [1] - 3:19
<b>22</b> [1] - 19:1	29:4	4:20 approved [4] - 4:19,	Boggs [1] - 1:9	<b>co</b> [1] - 36:2
<b>26</b> [1] - 29:21	accurate [2] - 29:10,	15:21, 17:13, 17:19	bottom [2] - 16:22,	co-development [1] -
20[1] 20.21	36:19	area [1] - 9:16	27:17	36:2
3	accused [1] - 32:12	arguably [1] - 34:13	break [1] - 20:18	coming [3] - 9:11,
	Achievement [1] -	argue [1] - 18:18	bring [2] - 2:23, 11:19	9:21, 21:14
<b>301</b> [2] - 5:11, 5:14	31:9	arguing [1] - 19:2	broadest [1] - 31:18 brought [1] - 11:22	comment [1] - 29:7 commercial [4] - 4:19,
<b>35</b> [8] - 26:13, 26:15,	activities [2] - 5:9,	argument [1] - 31:21	brush [1] - 31:18	19:14, 19:17, 20:8
26:22, 27:5, 27:6,	31:25	arguments [1] - 34:23	BY [3] - 1:16, 1:19,	company [1] - 6:1
27:10, 27:24, 28:11	actual [1] - 33:5	ARSHT [1] - 1:19	1:22	comparable [6] - 24:4,
<b>3:00</b> [1] - 1:12	add [1] - 27:11	Article [1] - 13:14	1.22	24:7, 29:18, 30:8,
	additional [2] - 28:25,	assert [1] - 32:1	С	30:17, 30:19
4	29:3	asserted [1] - 29:17		Complaint [1] - 13:11
4.2.4 ro. 40.40 40.40	address [2] - 10:13,	asserts [1] - 30:16	C.A [1] - 1:5	complete [1] - 34:5
<b>4.3.1</b> [2] - 16:13, 16:16	32:3	assistant [1] - 11:12	calculations [1] -	completely [2] - 18:1,
<b>4:12</b> [1] - 36:17	adequate [1] - 31:23	assume [1] - 36:5	24:24	22:14
_	admissible [2] -	assuming [1] - 34:18	Caleb [1] - 1:9	compliance [1] - 35:8
5	29:23, 30:4	assumption [1] -	cannot [1] - 29:12	concern [3] - 33:25,
<b>5</b> [1] - 26:1	adopted [3] - 15:21,	14:11	captured [1] - 17:12	34:1, 34:6
5 (i) 20.1	17:12, 17:19	assumptions [1] -	care [1] - 32:7	concerning [1] - 35:8
6	affect [1] - 26:3	15:24	case [5] - 19:10,	Conference [1] - 1:12
	afternoon [1] - 2:4	asterisk [2] - 14:20,	22:10, 22:22, 23:4,	confidence [1] - 33:19
<b>69</b> [2] - 31:3, 32:24	ago [1] - 15:6	14:22	27:15	Confidentiality [1] -
	agree [4] - 10:21,	attached [3] - 8:25,	cell [3] - 21:22, 26:11,	33:20
7	19:11, 24:11, 32:15	9:2, 16:14	32:1	considering [1] - 22:3
	agreed [1] - 25:2	attempting [1] - 30:3	cells [12] - 10:11,	contain [1] - 17:15
<b>70</b> [1] - 32:24	agreement [42] - 3:6,	Attorneys 1 [1] - 32:19	10:25, 21:23, 22:14,	containing [1] - 20:10
<b>72</b> [1] - 32:24	6:19, 7:8, 7:11, 7:19,	available [2] - 8:24,	22:21, 23:3, 23:7,	Contents [3] - 13:14,
<b>74</b> [1] - 32:24	7:22, 8:23, 9:6, 9:17,	33:11	23:15, 24:23, 31:17,	13:20, 20:2
	9:23, 10:6, 10:15, 10:22, 10:23, 10:24,	avoid [2] - 34:24,	32:12, 33:2	continue [1] - 21:22
	11:6, 15:3, 16:12,	34:25	certain [2] - 6:10, 21:11	continued [1] - 21:21
	, 10.0, 10.12,		21.11	

continuing [1] - 31:22 contract [1] - 35:24 controversial [1] -35:7 copy [1] - 13:6 corporate [2] - 35:22, correct [6] - 3:18, 12:3, 13:22, 14:13, 15:11, 23:1 correctly [1] - 22:19 corresponding [2] -20:10, 20:13 cost [2] - 17:14, 22:3 costs [2] - 17:8, 18:3 couple [2] - 6:7, 17:8 course [5] - 5:23, 8:3, 10:1, 10:4, 29:25 COURT [90] - 1:1, 2:4, 2:11, 2:13, 2:20, 2:22, 3:12, 4:13, 4:22, 5:17, 5:22, 5:25, 6:21, 7:10, 7:15, 8:6, 8:9, 8:14, 8:19, 8:25, 9:7, 10:3, 10:17, 11:1, 11:3, 11:10, 11:16, 11:18, 11:21, 11:25, 12:4, 12:10, 12:15, 12:18, 12:25, 13:3, 13:7, 13:13, 13:23, 14:3, 14:10, 14:14, 15:4, 15:15, 16:2, 16:5, 16:16, 16:19, 17:2, 17:7, 17:21, 18:11, 18:16, 18:24, 19:19, 19:24, 20:4, 20:11, 20:15, 20:22, 22:5, 22:10, 22:16, 22:25, 23:8, 23:21, 24:17, 24:24, 25:5, 25:22, 26:18, 26:21, 27:17, 28:5, 28:8, 28:18, 29:7, 31:2, 31:8, 32:5, 32:17, 34:3, 34:8, 34:16, 35:14, 35:17, 35:21, 36:3, 36:11, 36:15 court [1] - 7:18 Court [3] - 2:2, 36:17, 36:22 Courthouse [1] - 1:9 cross [1] - 34:5 cross-examined [1] -34:5 cultured [15] - 10:11, 10:25, 21:22, 21:23, 22:14, 22:21, 23:3, 23:7, 23:15, 24:23, 26:11, 31:16, 32:1,

32:12, 33:1 curious [1] - 13:13 cursory [1] - 18:20

damages [26] - 3:6,

8:20, 9:20, 9:21,

10:23, 16:3, 18:6,

18:23, 19:16, 26:11,

# D

8:5, 8:7, 8:14, 8:17,

27:4, 27:12, 29:4, 30:5, 30:9, 30:12, 30:14, 30:16, 31:19, 31:20, 34:18 date [2] - 4:23, 8:4 deal [3] - 19:17, 21:10, 21:11 debate [1] - 3:24 decent [1] - 4:24 decently [1] - 31:12 decide [1] - 33:12 Defendant [5] - 1:8, 1:23, 2:23, 3:8, 3:14 defined [1] - 32:11 definitely [1] - 29:17 definitions [2] - 15:5, 20:7 degree [1] - 33:19 **DELAWARE** [1] - 1:2 Delaware [1] - 1:10 delay [2] - 27:21, 27:23 delineate [1] - 23:18 Demand [1] - 14:9 deposition [3] - 30:24, 30:25, 31:1 depositions [1] - 30:7 **DEPUTY** [4] - 2:2, 20:19, 20:21, 36:14 **DEREK** [1] - 1:19 describe [1] - 21:7 destroyed [1] - 6:7 details [4] - 24:4, 29:12, 29:19, 31:24 Details [1] - 14:12 determine [1] - 19:15 developing [1] - 26:10 development [14] -7:24, 9:15, 9:19, 10:5, 16:20, 20:8, 21:21, 21:23, 22:4, 23:14, 26:12, 31:22, Development [3] -16:12, 16:16, 16:20 difference [2] - 26:25,

34:18

different [7] - 5:17,

7:7, 10:10, 11:23,

12:6, 19:9, 33:5 difficult [3] - 14:18, 27:2, 35:19 difficulty [1] - 16:6 direct [5] - 12:5, 14:8, 25:12, 25:21, 33:1 directed [1] - 13:18 directing [1] - 14:5 disagree [2] - 28:3, 29:21 disclose [1] - 7:3 disclosing [1] - 7:2 discovery [4] - 5:5, 6:12, 15:6, 29:22 **Discovery** [1] - 1:12 discussing [3] - 15:7, 15:9, 15:12 discussion [2] - 3:19, 3:21 Dispute [1] - 1:12 dispute [1] - 15:6 District [1] - 36:22 DISTRICT [2] - 1:1, 1:2 divide [1] - 27:7 document [8] - 17:18, 17:25, 18:5, 18:9, 30:20, 35:8, 35:9, 35:12 documentation [1] -5:25 dollar [2] - 35:1, 36:7 dollars [6] - 24:19, 25:10, 25:11, 26:2, 28:1, 34:22 done [1] - 3:16 down [1] - 17:10 drug [3] - 4:3, 22:20, 22:24 **Duchenne** [1] - 22:22 due [1] - 8:18 during [2] - 27:10, 29:22 Dystrophy [1] - 22:23

# Ε

earn [1] - 29:3 economist [4] - 21:17, 27:3, 27:13, 28:8 17:16, 28:10 editing [6] - 10:16, 23:6, 32:7, 32:8, expert [21] - 8:18, 32:15, 33:23 effect [1] - 6:3 effectively [2] - 21:19, 27:8 23:24, 24:3, 24:24, efficient [1] - 11:24 25:9, 27:12, 30:9, either [2] - 21:20, 32:20, 33:9, 33:17, 30:15 34:4, 34:18 emails [1] - 5:5 expert's [4] - 21:15, EMANUEL [1] - 1:21 22:11, 27:4, 27:17

ends [1] - 29:22 enrollment [1] - 5:11 entire [1] - 33:11 entirely [1] - 29:10 entitled [2] - 14:8, 19:23 ESQUIRE [3] - 1:16, 1:19, 1:22 essentially [4] - 5:18, 7:4, 27:3, 34:10 Estepan's [1] - 31:1 et [1] - 2:7 Europe [1] - 5:1 European [1] - 5:9 event [3] - 15:17, 24:6, 31:9 events [1] - 31:11 evidence [2] - 29:23, ex [4] - 5:9, 5:11, 31:16, 31:24 ex-US [4] - 5:9, 5:11, 31:16, 31:24 exactly [5] - 9:25, 21:13, 21:17, 23:18 examined [1] - 34:5 example [2] - 26:7, 32:23 excellent [1] - 11:12 excuse [4] - 7:24, 20:12, 26:10, 30:19 executed [1] - 14:1 exhibit [2] - 30:25 Exhibit [1] - 13:10 exists [1] - 6:11 exon [8] - 10:7, 10:15, 22:12, 22:20, 22:23, 32:16, 33:23, 34:21 exon-skipping [2] -22:20, 22:23 expect [1] - 16:13 expectation [1] -14:25 expectations [1] - 8:4 expected [1] - 17:10 expecting [3] - 14:16, expenses [1] - 17:8 8:20, 9:22, 9:23, 10:12, 10:23, 16:3, 19:16, 20:25, 23:10,

end [3] - 30:5, 36:8,

36:10

expiration [5] - 4:4, 4:12, 4:14, 15:8, 15:14 expire [2] - 21:25, 26:13 expired [2] - 4:24, 4:25 explain [1] - 27:12 extensively [1] - 9:22 extent [10] - 5:8, 17:4, 17:11, 18:2, 18:19, 23:24, 24:1, 27:14, 31:20, 32:23 Eyes [1] - 32:19

## F

fact [2] - 30:7, 33:17 factor [1] - 27:15 factored [2] - 26:24, 27:1 facts [1] - 9:16 Fahnestock [1] - 2:16 FAHNESTOCK [1] -1:19 far [4] - 5:6, 27:12, 27:14, 31:25 FDA [1] - 5:16 Fernands [13] - 2:19, 2:20, 4:14, 7:20, 13:2, 13:5, 13:13, 15:11, 16:21, 23:1, 23:23, 29:8, 31:3 FERNANDS [36] -1:22, 2:19, 2:21, 4:1, 4:16, 5:3, 5:20, 5:24, 6:10, 11:13, 11:17, 11:19, 11:22, 12:2, 13:10, 13:21, 14:1, 15:18, 16:25, 17:4, 17:11, 18:14, 18:17, 19:2, 23:24, 29:9, 30:15, 30:22, 31:7, 31:14, 33:22, 34:11, 35:6, 35:15, 35:25, 36:9 Fernands '[1] - 35:19 few [1] - 12:13 figures [2] - 35:2, 36:7 final [5] - 4:7, 15:19, 31:16, 31:25, 32:25 financial [1] - 34:14 financials [1] - 18:21 fine [1] - 7:15 first [2] - 14:7, 20:5 Fish [1] - 19:11 FISH [1] - 1:16 five [1] - 26:1 focused [1] - 34:12 FOR [1] - 1:2

Forecast [1] - 14:9 forecasts [4] - 15:13, 29:6, 29:9, 29:11 foregoing [1] - 36:18 forget [1] - 4:23 forgetting [1] - 27:25 form [1] - 33:22 formed [1] - 22:2 forward [2] - 21:10, 21:14

frankly [1] - 10:18 free [1] - 22:16 Friday [1] - 8:18 fruition [1] - 17:5 fulfilling [1] - 20:13 full [2] - 15:3, 21:12 fully [3] - 13:5, 14:19, 18:10 fun [1] - 31:2

# G

future [1] - 24:2

gather [1] - 9:7 gene [15] - 10:16, 10:24, 15:13, 15:20, 22:12, 23:6, 32:6, 32:7, 32:8, 32:10, 32:13, 32:15, 33:23, 34:21, 35:3 gene-editing [1] - 23:6 general [4] - 17:9, 21:5, 29:18 generally [1] - 15:19 generate [1] - 28:15 Georgia [1] - 25:4 Georgia -Pacific [1] -25:4 germane [1] - 6:22 Global [3] - 16:11. 16:16, 16:20 global [5] - 5:15, 7:24, 9:15, 9:19, 10:5 graphs [1] - 27:14 grow [1] - 22:13 guess [4] - 12:5, 13:23, 19:6, 25:22

#### Н

guys [1] - 7:10

handicap [1] - 33:10 hands [1] - 25:6 handwriting [1] - 2:18 happy [2] - 7:18, 32:3 harbor [4] - 3:6, 8:10, 8:11, 30:13 header [1] - 35:13 hear [2] - 7:15, 7:17

heard [1] - 32:22 hearing [1] - 29:15 Heather [1] - 36:21 help [1] - 16:7 helpful [3] - 7:9, 7:14, 13:9

hereby [1] - 36:18 high [2] - 21:15, 33:19 highlighted [3] -11:14, 12:21

highly [1] - 9:10 hint [1] - 21:1 hold [7] - 13:3, 13:23, 14:14, 18:12, 20:11, 21:16, 30:3

holding [1] - 14:21 honest [1] - 34:6 Honor [40] - 3:11, 3:18, 7:7, 7:25, 8:17, 9:14, 11:2, 11:9,

11:13, 12:9, 12:13, 13:1, 14:2, 14:8, 14:13, 14:18, 14:20, 15:10, 16:10, 16:14, 16:18, 18:15, 19:6, 20:3, 20:6, 21:16, 22:9, 22:20, 23:17, 24:12, 25:8, 26:5, 27:2, 27:20, 29:1, 29:20, 31:7, 33:24,

Honor's [1] - 18:10 HONORABLE [1] -1:14

35:11, 36:10

Honorable [1] - 2:3 hope [2] - 19:2, 35:6 host [12] - 10:25, 21:22, 21:23, 22:21, 23:3, 23:7, 23:15, 24:23, 26:11, 31:16, 32:1, 32:12

hundred [4] - 3:18, 6:22, 23:12, 26:2

hundred -percent [1] -6:22

hypothesized [1] -29:2

hypothetical [9] - 8:5, 9:10, 9:12, 9:21, 15:22, 17:24, 21:8,

21:18, 24:15 hypothetically [1] -25:24

hypotheticals [1] -

#### ı

idea [1] - 21:5 impact [1] - 26:4 implicated [1] - 22:22 important [1] - 9:12 IN [1] - 1:1 INC [2] - 1:4, 1:7 include [4] - 28:20, 28:22, 28:24, 32:20 included [1] - 19:5 including [1] - 29:11 incurred [1] - 28:1 indicated [1] - 4:5 inform [2] - 9:20, 24:15

information [28] - 3:2, 3:8, 3:23, 5:7, 6:11, 6:17, 12:23, 17:5, 17:14, 17:23, 18:19, 21:2, 23:16, 23:19, 24:9, 28:11, 28:13, 28:14, 29:19, 29:22, 31:10, 31:11, 31:13, 31:15, 32:22, 33:16, 36:1, 36:2

informed [1] - 9:18 **infringing** [1] - 32:2 instance [1] - 17:14 interested [1] - 10:20 interesting [1] - 36:12 internal [1] - 35:7 interrogatory [3] -30:8, 30:16, 30:18

Interrogatory [1] -30:20

irrelevant [2] - 19:3, 34:22

issue [6] - 3:20, 7:25, 8:2, 8:3, 8:15, 8:17 issues [6] - 15:2, 25:20, 29:11, 30:12,

30:13, 30:14 items [1] - 9:18

# J

Japan [1] - 5:1 Joint [2] - 16:11, 16:16 joint [1] - 7:23

## Κ

keeps [1] - 6:1 kind [3] - 14:17, 22:6, 28:24 kinds [1] - 15:2 King [1] - 1:10 knowing [1] - 28:19 knowledge [3] - 4:17, 18:4, 19:8

## L

lack [4] - 17:23, 18:4, 19:7, 23:9 large [5] - 6:15, 21:10, 22:5, 22:11, 31:12 larger [1] - 31:20 last [1] - 14:3 last-minute [1] - 14:3 lawyers [2] - 19:11, 19:12 Lead [1] - 31:4 lead [6] - 31:6, 31:9, 32:22, 33:14, 33:15, leafing [1] - 19:25 least [8] - 17:9, 23:13, 24:13, 25:20, 28:21, 28:23, 30:12, 33:15 leaving [1] - 25:17 letter [2] - 8:11, 10:4 letters [1] - 2:22 letting [1] - 19:15 level [1] - 21:15 license [14] - 9:13, 18:7, 21:20, 22:17, 24:7, 25:18, 25:19, 26:10, 26:15, 26:17, 27:11, 27:16, 30:17, 33:10 licenses [2] - 30:8, 30:19 likelihood [1] - 24:13 limited [1] - 5:5 line [1] - 27:17 list [1] - 20:2 listed [2] - 35:10 LLP [1] - 1:19

looking [8] - 13:14, 16:6, 16:21, 17:22, 18:17, 20:1, 21:10, 35:21

look [3] - 12:20, 13:17,

looks [1] - 27:4 lose [1] - 26:15 loss [1] - 28:1

19:15

lost [1] - 25:3 loud [1] - 14:12

lump [3] - 25:1, 27:18, 28:12

### М

magic [1] - 12:15 main [2] - 15:17, 15:18 managed [1] - 33:17 manufacturer [1] - 4:8 marked [1] - 30:6 market [1] - 25:17

marketed [1] - 22:20 materials [1] - 24:21 mean [6] - 5:22, 5:23, 16:19, 28:11, 35:21, 35:22 memorized [1] - 25:14 mentioned [1] - 16:11 mere [1] - 26:23 Merit [1] - 36:21

method [1] - 33:2 might [11] - 3:2, 5:4, 10:1, 11:17, 11:23, 13:1, 18:5, 20:7, 29:16, 29:24, 32:11 milestone [2] - 24:5, 31:9

Milestones [1] - 31:5 milestones [2] -21:11, 23:10 million [9] - 25:25, 26:2, 26:8, 26:16,

26:22, 26:23, 26:24,

27:21 mind [8] - 2:25, 9:11, 17:24, 24:8, 24:15, 25:16, 31:22, 33:10 minute [3] - 14:3,

14:15, 20:11 misquote [2] - 25:14, 27:19

misrepresent [1] -5:13

missing [6] - 3:21, 12:22, 12:23, 18:1, 21:13, 23:16

misspoke [1] - 20:12 model [2] - 27:4, 29:4 models [2] - 27:14, 28:2

money [2] - 22:17, 25:5 month [4] - 9:8, 26:1,

26:8, 26:16 months [8] - 26:13, 26:15, 26:22, 27:5, 27:6, 27:10, 27:24,

28:11

MORRIS [1] - 1:19 Morrison [11] - 2:8, 2:15, 3:1, 3:10, 4:5, 6:24, 12:4, 13:25, 17:16, 17:21, 20:25

MORRISON [65] -1:16, 2:10, 2:12, 3:11, 3:17, 7:6, 7:13, 7:17, 8:8, 8:13, 8:16, 8:20, 9:2, 9:9, 10:14, 10:18, 11:2, 11:9, 12:8, 12:11, 12:17, 12:20, 13:1, 13:4,

13:8, 13:12, 14:7, 14:13, 14:18, 15:10, 15:16, 16:4, 16:10, 16:18, 17:22, 19:6, 19:20, 20:3, 20:6, 20:12, 21:4, 22:8, 22:15, 22:19, 23:1, 23:12, 24:11, 24:22, 25:1, 25:8, 26:4, 26:19, 27:1, 27:19, 28:7, 28:16, 28:19, 29:20, 30:18, 30:24, 32:3, 32:8, 33:24, 34:4, 35:18 Morrison 's [1] - 13:18 most [1] - 11:23 move [1] - 18:14 MS [99] - 2:10, 2:12, 2:19, 2:21, 3:11, 3:17, 4:1, 4:16, 5:3, 5:20, 5:24, 6:10, 7:6, 7:13, 7:17, 8:8, 8:13, 8:16, 8:20, 9:2, 9:9, 10:14, 10:18, 11:2, 11:9, 11:13, 11:17, 11:19, 11:22, 12:2, 12:8, 12:11, 12:17, 12:20, 13:1, 13:4, 13:8, 13:10, 13:12, 13:21, 14:1, 14:7, 14:13, 14:18, 15:10, 15:16, 15:18, 16:4, 16:10, 16:18, 16:25, 17:4, 17:11, 17:22, 18:14, 18:17, 19:2, 19:6, 19:20, 20:3, 20:6, 20:12, 21:4, 22:8, 22:15, 22:19, 23:1, 23:12, 23:24, 24:11, 24:22, 25:1, 25:8, 26:4, 26:19, 27:1, 27:19, 28:7, 28:16, 28:19, 29:9, 29:20, 30:15, 30:18, 30:22, 30:24, 31:7, 31:14, 32:3, 32:8, 33:22, 33:24, 34:4, 34:11, 35:6, 35:15, 35:18, 35:25, 36:9

# Ν

multiple [2] - 30:7

must [1] - 32:20

Muscular [1] - 22:23

name [1] - 2:9 necessarily [1] - 29:23 needed [2] - 15:12, 21:23 negotiation [9] - 8:5,

9:10, 9:12, 9:21, 15:22, 17:25, 21:8, 21:18, 24:16 negotiator 's [1] - 9:11 next [4] - 16:10, 17:8, 26:1, 26:22 NICHOLS [1] - 1:19 none [2] - 5:1, 24:2 North [1] - 1:10 notes [2] - 3:4, 36:19 nothing [5] - 9:16, 10:10, 18:21, 35:23 nothing 's [1] - 5:14 notice [1] - 13:18 noticed [1] - 13:22 November [1] - 4:4 number [9] - 12:15, 15:23, 22:5, 22:12, 24:17, 27:4, 27:18, 27:22, 30:22 Number [1] - 30:20 numbers [6] - 12:9, 14:16, 14:24, 16:7, 16:23, 31:12

# 0

objection [1] - 33:25 obviously [2] - 17:25, 24:11 occurred [1] - 15:7 OF [1] - 1:2 offer [1] - 7:22 once [2] - 10:10, 26:21 one [23] - 9:16, 10:3, 10:7, 11:11, 11:12, 11:20, 12:7, 12:12, 12:22, 13:3, 13:8, 14:23, 16:9, 16:11, 16:22, 18:13, 19:11, 19:20, 19:25, 20:1, 23:10, 23:11, 36:6 ones [1] - 23:11 ongoing [1] - 4:20 opening [3] - 8:17, 8:21, 21:1 operating [2] - 18:4, 19:7 opinions [1] - 33:18 opposed [1] - 23:11 Order [3] - 19:10, 33:20, 36:16 order [4] - 21:22, 27:24, 29:3, 32:20 ordered [1] - 15:20 otherwise [3] - 4:21, 17:3, 35:4 ought [1] - 35:4 outside [1] - 5:2

overall [1] - 29:18

own [2] - 28:22, 29:6

p.m [2] - 1:12, 36:17

page [2] - 16:21, 20:5

18:20, 19:5, 31:3,

Pacific [1] - 25:4

Page [8] - 18:18,

32:24

#### Р

pages [2] - 17:9, 34:13 Pages [1] - 19:1 pagination [2] - 12:6, 12:7 paid [4] - 25:10, 25:11, 28:10, 31:24 paper [1] - 13:6 paragraphs [1] - 14:17 part [11] - 8:1, 8:2, 8:3, 8:22, 16:22, 20:23, 22:2, 22:7, 22:8, 31:10, 33:18 partially [2] - 12:12, 12:23 particular [3] - 10:6, 24:5, 35:24 particularly [1] - 10:22 parties [4] - 3:24, 7:20, 8:18, 25:2 parties' [1] - 8:4 partly [1] - 33:16 partner's [1] - 36:2 parts [7] - 10:19, 10:21, 21:13, 32:5, 34:7, 34:9, 34:10 past [1] - 8:18 patent [10] - 4:4, 4:12, 4:14, 4:24, 4:25, 10:11, 15:8, 15:14, 21:24, 26:12 patented [5] - 10:25, 21:22, 21:23, 23:15, 26:11 pausing [1] - 11:4 pay [3] - 18:7, 26:25, payment [6] - 22:7, 23:14, 24:1, 24:18, 25:1, 26:8 payments [10] - 21:11, 23:9, 25:23, 27:9, 28:24, 29:3, 29:5, 31:12, 32:6, 32:25 Penn [1] - 19:12 Pennsylvania [1] - 2:7 percent [5] - 3:18, 6:22, 23:12, 35:14, 35:15 percentage [1] - 24:5 perhaps [5] - 6:22,

8:16, 21:13, 23:1, 32:14 period [1] - 15:25 personally [1] - 5:23 pharmaceutical [1] -24:19 picture [1] - 31:20 piece [2] - 3:24, 23:6 place [4] - 5:2, 14:7, 18:4, 19:7 Plaintiff [2] - 1:5, 1:17 Plaintiff's [1] - 3:5 Plaintiffs [1] - 4:2 plan [3] - 7:24, 9:15, 9:19 Plan [3] - 16:12, 16:17, 16:20 Plans [1] - 14:9 play [1] - 25:6 podium [1] - 7:14 point [10] - 7:19, 7:21, 7:23, 8:16, 11:6, 15:21, 18:24, 27:18, 28:9, 30:2 pointed [1] - 34:14 policies [1] - 35:8 policy [2] - 35:22, 36:7 portions [5] - 10:15, 10:23, 21:3, 21:6 position [2] - 9:20, 21:7 potential [1] - 29:1 potentially [1] - 14:24 prefer [2] - 34:24, 34:25 present [1] - 15:22 presiding [1] - 2:3 presumably [2] - 2:17, 3:16 pretty [1] - 9:22 pricing [1] - 34:10 problem [1] - 36:12 proceeding [1] - 36:20 PROCEEDINGS [1] -2:1 produce [11] - 15:13, 15:21, 15:23, 18:25, 19:1, 24:10, 30:1, 33:22, 36:6, 36:8, 36:9 produced [10] - 4:2, 4:3, 4:7, 8:23, 9:3, 17:3, 17:13, 17:19, 29:14, 33:21 Product [1] - 31:4 product [17] - 4:3, 4:7, 5:10, 5:19, 7:1, 7:5,

15:14, 21:21, 22:21,

32:10, 32:22, 33:15,

31:6, 31:9, 32:7,

35:2, 35:3 production [5] - 6:15, 15:3, 24:12, 32:21, 33:2 products [6] - 15:20, 31:16, 31:25, 32:13, 32:25 profits [2] - 17:10, progress [5] - 23:9, 25:23, 26:8, 26:9, 29:3 projection [2] - 17:17, 18:2 projections [15] -15:19, 15:21, 16:1, 16:3, 17:13, 17:15, 17:20, 24:8, 28:16, 28:20, 29:14, 31:23, 33:5, 33:6 pronounce [1] - 2:8 Protective [1] - 19:10 provide [5] - 4:9, 6:11, 6:12, 24:9, 31:11 provided [5] - 3:8. 3:14, 6:2, 6:13, 24:9 provision [3] - 26:7, 26:20, 29:2 provisions [1] - 29:25 public [12] - 12:2, 13:15, 18:1, 20:23, 21:2, 24:1, 28:13, 29:19, 31:5, 31:8, 35:10, 35:16 publicly [1] - 8:23 purposes [2] - 8:5, 18:23 put [1] - 6:17

### Q

qualified [1] - 34:19 qualitative [1] - 33:3 quality [1] - 20:13 quantitative [2] - 25:7, 33:3 quantity [1] - 20:10 quarters [1] - 24:18 questions [2] - 8:9, 18:10 QUINN [1] - 1:21 quite [2] - 12:12, 28:3 quote [1] - 25:21

# R

range [1] - 28:9 rather [1] - 35:9 read [2] - 2:22, 14:14 real [4] - 7:19, 7:21,

7:23, 34:25 Real [1] - 36:21 Real-Time [1] - 36:21 reality [1] - 17:5 really [4] - 8:9, 26:16, 30:12, 35:22 reason [2] - 20:6, 29:24 reasonable [6] -24:13, 24:25, 25:3, 25:6, 28:5, 33:15 receive [2] - 4:10, 27:10 recess [1] - 36:13 Recess [1] - 20:20 recessed [1] - 36:17 recited [1] - 30:25 records [5] - 3:19, 3:22, 4:6, 4:7, 4:10 redact [2] - 34:9, 36:4 redacted [20] - 2:24, 8:22, 9:22, 11:11, 11:15, 11:24, 12:1, 12:2, 12:23, 13:5, 14:19, 23:19, 23:20, 31:10, 31:11, 33:22, 34:23, 35:1, 35:14, 35:15 redaction [1] - 34:20 redactions [1] - 36:6 refer [2] - 19:22, 20:9 referring [1] - 10:14 refused [1] - 30:1 Regenxbio [7] - 2:10, 2:11, 2:12, 18:8, 19:9, 27:6, 27:11 REGENXBIO [1] - 1:4 Regenxbio 's [1] - 9:16 Regulatory [1] - 31:4 regulatory [3] - 5:9, 31:9, 32:22 relate [1] - 10:15 related [3] - 4:6, 23:6, 23:14 relates [1] - 7:8 relating [1] - 32:6 relationship [1] -32:25 released [1] - 4:8 relevance [1] - 7:8 relevant [32] - 3:6, 6:18, 9:10, 9:19, 10:22, 14:25, 17:10, 17:12, 18:5, 18:6, 18:19, 18:22, 19:4, 19:8, 19:9, 19:16, 20:7, 24:6, 24:14, 29:19, 30:5, 30:11, 30:14, 31:13, 31:15, 31:19, 31:20, 32:11,

32:14, 32:16, 33:12, 33:16 relied [7] - 8:22, 9:5, 10:23, 22:8, 24:3, 24:6, 24:7 rely [3] - 9:4, 9:22, 29:24 relying [2] - 23:25, remember [1] - 15:8 removed [3] - 31:25, 33:23, 34:1 reply [1] - 8:21 report [9] - 8:21, 9:23, 10:12, 21:1, 25:14, 30:16, 33:17 reported [2] - 17:6, 24:2 Reporter [1] - 36:21 reporter [1] - 7:18 reports [2] - 8:18, 30:10 representation [1] -35:20 represented [2] - 4:2, 4:9 requesting [1] - 15:2 require [2] - 29:2, 29:21 required [1] - 21:21 requirements [1] -20:13 respect [1] - 34:11 respond [1] - 19:7 response [2] - 3:7, 30:19 responses [2] - 30:8, 30:16 rest [3] - 18:15, 34:10, 34:14 revenue [1] - 28:14 review [1] - 18:21 RICHARD [1] - 1:14 Richard [1] - 2:3 Richardson [1] -19:12 RICHARDSON [1] -1:16 rise [4] - 2:2, 20:19, 20:21, 36:14 risk [3] - 19:14, 19:17, 19:18 road [1] - 17:10 Roche [14] - 8:23, 9:6, 9:23, 14:25, 21:10, 21:12, 22:2, 25:11, 28:24, 29:12, 35:7, 35:8, 35:12, 36:7

roughly [1] - 33:6

royalty [3] - 24:25,

25:3, 25:7 Rule [1] - 29:21 run [1] - 5:6 running [1] - 5:15

# S

safe [4] - 3:6, 8:10,

8:11, 30:13

sales [5] - 15:13, 17:17, 28:22, 29:6 sales-type [1] - 17:17 Sarepta [37] - 2:7, 5:7, 5:11, 5:15, 5:16, 9:11, 9:13, 10:4, 10:19, 15:12, 15:23, 18:7, 19:8, 19:14, 19:18, 21:18, 22:16, 22:20, 25:10, 26:9, 26:11, 26:14, 26:17, 27:5, 27:10, 27:16, 27:23, 28:1, 28:3, 29:1, 29:2, 29:5, 29:25, 30:2, 32:2, 32:14 **SAREPTA** [1] - 1:7 Sarepta's [14] - 9:20, 14:25, 15:19, 15:25, 17:23, 21:7, 24:7, 24:15, 25:16, 28:16, 28:21, 28:22, 31:21, 31:23 saw [2] - 19:24, 34:13 schedule [8] - 16:12, 16:19, 16:23, 19:21, 20:1, 20:10, 34:14, 35:7 Schedule [2] - 16:13, 19:22 schedules [3] - 34:11, 34:12, 35:11 science [1] - 23:2 scope [1] - 21:12 seated [2] - 2:5, 20:22 second [4] - 3:13, 6:15, 10:4, 13:3 section [1] - 12:9 Section [2] - 12:24, 14:8 sections [3] - 9:25, 12:21, 19:21 see [20] - 2:15, 3:2, 7:13, 11:24, 14:20, 16:17, 16:19, 18:9, 18:21, 19:10, 19:12, 19:18, 19:20, 20:5, 20:15, 21:6, 23:20, 26:6, 32:23, 35:11 seeking [1] - 29:22

sent [5] - 5:1, 5:10, 5:14, 6:5, 6:16 serve [1] - 36:15 session [1] - 2:3 set [1] - 36:6 several [2] - 19:21, 25:15 short [1] - 20:18 show [1] - 30:3 side [1] - 6:25 signed [1] - 9:6 significant [1] - 8:15 similar [1] - 33:4 simply [2] - 14:20, 14:22 sitting [5] - 4:21, 4:22, 4:25, 6:5, 6:6 skipping [6] - 10:16, 22:20, 22:23, 32:16, 33:23, 34:21 slightly [2] - 5:17, 7:7 somewhat [1] - 33:7 somewhere [1] -25:24 sorry [3] - 3:11, 11:2, 14:1 sort [9] - 3:1, 3:7, 6:25, 17:14, 17:17, 17:23, 18:2, 21:2, 28:9 sorts [1] - 25:20 specific [2] - 10:24, 24:4 speculation [1] -29:16 splicing [2] - 22:12, 34.21spreadsheet [6] - 4:3, 4:6, 4:11, 6:2, 6:13, 6:15 spreadsheets [2] -15:24, 15:25 **SRP** [2] - 23:11, 24:21 SRP-9001 [8] - 3:9, 3:15, 4:3, 23:15, 24:22, 26:10, 31:6, 32:13 stand [1] - 3:12 standard [1] - 30:3 start [2] - 12:12, 31:18 started [3] - 8:11, 8:12

starting [1] - 18:18

31:21, 33:10

state [7] - 9:11, 17:24,

24:7, 24:15, 25:16,

statement [1] - 35:22

segue [1] - 7:12

senses [1] - 12:11

34:20

sense [3] - 17:9, 25:9,

States [2] - 3:15, 5:2 STATES [1] - 1:1 stay [1] - 7:18 stenographic [1] -36:19 step [1] - 31:15 sticking [3] - 7:19, 7:21, 7:23 still [4] - 3:18, 3:20, 3:23, 4:16 stop [3] - 21:24, 22:4, 26:12 Street [1] - 1:10 strokes [1] - 31:19 stuff [6] - 4:13, 4:15, 11:7, 11:25, 15:7, 15:8 submission [1] - 5:16 submitted [2] - 4:19, 8:21 SULLIVAN [1] - 1:21 sum [3] - 25:1, 27:18, 28:12 supply [3] - 20:8, 20:9 support [1] - 33:18 suppose [1] - 24:25 supposed [1] - 28:15 surface [1] - 20:15 SUSAN [1] - 1:16 suspect [1] - 9:17 suspicion [2] - 9:18, 10:1

# Т

tab [3] - 29:12, 29:13 table [1] - 25:18 Table [4] - 13:14, 13:19, 20:2, 31:4 tabs [1] - 29:11 talks [1] - 32:6 team [2] - 3:20, 7:20 technical [2] - 34:15, 34:16 tentatively [1] - 16:8 term [1] - 26:13 terms [2] - 3:25, 5:25 THE [92] - 1:1, 1:2, 1:14, 2:4, 2:11, 2:13, 2:20, 2:22, 3:12, 4:13, 4:22, 5:17, 5:22, 5:25, 6:21, 7:10, 7:15, 8:6, 8:9, 8:14, 8:19, 8:25, 9:7, 10:3, 10:17, 11:1, 11:3, 11:10, 11:16, 11:18, 11:21, 11:25, 12:4, 12:10, 12:15, 12:18, 12:25, 13:3, 13:7, 13:13, 13:23,

seem [2] - 17:7, 31:12

14:3, 14:10, 14:14, 15:4, 15:15, 16:2, 16:5, 16:16, 16:19,	36:6 type [2] - 17:4, 17:17 types [1] - 17:15	volumes [1] - 18:3 vs [1] - 2:7
17:2, 17:7, 17:21, 18:11, 18:16, 18:24,	- 11	W
19:19, 19:24, 20:4,	U	wait [4] - 21:24, 26:12,
20:11, 20:15, 20:22,	<b>U.S</b> [3] - 28:22, 29:6,	27:23, 28:2
22:5, 22:10, 22:16,	36:22	warehouse [2] - 4:16,
22:25, 23:8, 23:21, 24:17, 24:24, 25:5,	U.S.D.C.J [1] - 1:14 ultimate [1] - 15:13	6:5 <b>ways</b> [1] - 18:19
25:22, 26:18, 26:21,	unaware [1] - 29:5	week [2] - 36:8, 36:10
27:17, 28:5, 28:8,	under [2] - 13:14, 25:4	whole [2] - 10:9, 34:19
28:18, 29:7, 31:2, 31:8, 32:5, 32:17,	underlying [1] - 15:24	wild [1] - 18:25
34:3, 34:8, 34:16,	understood [1] - 3:7 undertaking [2] -	willing [1] - 18:7 Wilmington [1] - 1:10
35:14, 35:17, 35:21,	33:13, 33:16	wondering [2] - 13:19,
36:3, 36:11, 36:15	UNITED [1] - 1:1	25:22
theory [4] - 3:5, 21:15, 22:13, 26:11	United [2] - 3:15, 5:2	word [2] - 17:24, 23:9
THERAPEUTICS [1] -	University [1] - 2:6 unless [2] - 4:17, 5:10	words [3] - 10:9, 11:16, 21:9
1:7	unredacted [8] - 2:23,	world [1] - 24:20
therapy [7] - 10:24,	7:22, 11:11, 11:14,	worth [1] - 25:19
15:13, 15:20, 32:6, 32:10, 32:13, 35:3	11:19, 21:3, 21:6,	write [1] - 28:8
they've [2] - 6:2, 7:5	22:6 up [6] - 3:23, 14:21,	wrote [1] - 8:11
thinking [4] - 16:6,	18:20, 19:5, 29:22,	Υ
22:1, 22:3, 26:14	30:5	
thinks [1] - 19:16 third [2] - 18:13, 19:19	updated [1] - 6:14	years [5] - 4:23, 4:24,
three [6] - 11:22,	upfront [4] - 22:6, 23:14, 24:18, 28:12	6:7, 15:25, 26:1 yellow [3] - 11:21,
12:16, 12:19, 15:25,	upfronts [1] - 23:25	11:25, 14:11
24:18, 34:13	URQUHART [1] - 1:21	
three -quarters [1] - 24:18	<b>US</b> [4] - 5:9, 5:11, 31:16, 31:24	
throughout [1] - 20:7	31.10, 31.24	
thrust [1] - 15:18	V	
title [1] - 35:16 together [2] - 6:17,	valuable to 26:16	
15:1	valuable [1] - 26:16 valuation [1] - 28:4	
touched [1] - 30:13	value [12] - 25:17,	
towards [1] - 26:9	27:5, 27:7, 27:11,	
transcript [2] - 36:15, 36:19	27:15, 27:22, 28:25, 29:18, 31:22, 32:1,	
treat [1] - 22:22	33:1	
trial [6] - 5:11, 5:14,	valued [1] - 27:21	
5:15, 5:16, 6:6	values [1] - 28:9	
<b>trials</b> [4] - 4:18, 4:20, 5:6, 6:14	valuing [1] - 26:17 varieties [1] - 11:23	
tried [1] - 6:11	variety [1] - 29:11	
Triozzi [1] - 36:21	various [2] - 23:10,	
true [2] - 23:5, 36:18	31:11	
Tournton to O.C		
Trustee [1] - 2:6 trv [4] - 7:21, 11:9.	version [15] - 7:22, 8:22, 9:3, 9:22, 12:3.	
Trustee [1] - 2:6 try [4] - 7:21, 11:9, 11:10, 16:9	<b>version</b> [15] - 7:22, 8:22, 9:3, 9:22, 12:3, 13:5, 13:15, 14:2,	
try [4] - 7:21, 11:9, 11:10, 16:9 trying [1] - 19:25	8:22, 9:3, 9:22, 12:3, 13:5, 13:15, 14:2, 14:19, 16:15, 18:1,	
try [4] - 7:21, 11:9, 11:10, 16:9 trying [1] - 19:25 Tuesday [1] - 1:11	8:22, 9:3, 9:22, 12:3, 13:5, 13:15, 14:2, 14:19, 16:15, 18:1, 31:5, 31:8, 35:10,	
try [4] - 7:21, 11:9, 11:10, 16:9 trying [1] - 19:25 Tuesday [1] - 1:11 TUNNELL [1] - 1:19	8:22, 9:3, 9:22, 12:3, 13:5, 13:15, 14:2, 14:19, 16:15, 18:1,	
try [4] - 7:21, 11:9, 11:10, 16:9 trying [1] - 19:25 Tuesday [1] - 1:11	8:22, 9:3, 9:22, 12:3, 13:5, 13:15, 14:2, 14:19, 16:15, 18:1, 31:5, 31:8, 35:10, 35:12	
try [4] - 7:21, 11:9, 11:10, 16:9 trying [1] - 19:25 Tuesday [1] - 1:11 TUNNELL [1] - 1:19 two [11] - 2:23, 2:24,	8:22, 9:3, 9:22, 12:3, 13:5, 13:15, 14:2, 14:19, 16:15, 18:1, 31:5, 31:8, 35:10, 35:12 versions [2] - 2:24	